THE

EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.

THIRD SERIES.

Volume V.

WITH ETCHING OF CANON WESTCOTT,
BY H. MANESSE.

London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.
MDCCCLXXXVII.
[*All rights reserved.*]

Ser. 3
v. 5
1887:1

THE EXPOSITOR.

Contributors to Volume V.

Rev. Prof. J. Agar Beet.
Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D.D.
Rev. Prof. A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D.
Principal Sir J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S.
Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D.
Rev. Prof. S. R. Driver, D.D.
Josiah Gilbert.
Rev. Prof. F. Godet, D.D.
Rev. C. Gore, M.A.
Rev. Prof. A. Harnack, D.D., Ph.D.
Prof. J. Rendel Harris, M.A.
Rev. Prof. A. F. Kirkpatrick, M.A.
Rev. Alexander Maclaren, D.D.
Rev. J. Macpherson, M.A.
T. E. Page, M.A.
Rev. Frederick Rendall, M.A.
Rev. Prof. W. Sanday, D.D.
Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D.
Rev. W. H. Simcox, M.A.
Rev. Prof. H. L. Strack, D.D., Ph.D.
Rev. Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D.
Rev. Prof. B. F. Westcott, D.D., D.C.L.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

I. Recent Theories.

The systematic investigation of the origin of the Christian Ministry, which has received a fresh impulse, and has been carried on with renewed activity in recent years, connects itself more particularly with three names: those of Bp. Lightfoot, Dr. Hatch, and Dr. A. Harnack. Each of these names seems to mark a distinct stage in the inquiry. And as a preliminary to attempting something of an estimate of the position in which the question now stands, we cannot do better than look back over the course by which it has proceeded. The present paper will contain such a retrospect; it will be followed by a second, the object of which will be more directly critical.

I. Bp. Lightfoot's views are developed in the Commentary on Philippians, partly in an additional note, *On the Synonymes, "bishop" and "presbyter"* (pp. 93–97, ed. 1), and partly in the elaborate essay *On the Christian Ministry*. The note and the essay must be taken closely together. The note supplies the scientific foundation on which the main positions of the essay are built. It is for want of seeing this, that some of the criticisms on the essay, notably that by the Bishop of St. Andrews (*Remarks on Dr. Lightfoot's Essay, etc.*: Oxford and London, 1879), are really wide of the mark. They fail to go to the root of the position, and are aimed at detached points here and there, without observing how they mutually hang together and are related to each other in logical connexion.

I do not propose to follow Dr. Lightfoot into all the side issues and subordinate sections of his subject. It will be enough if we keep to those main points which lie most in the track of controversy. If we single out four such points, three of them will consist in a marshalling of the facts; the fourth only is a matter of theory.

(1) Bp. Lightfoot starts from the position, which is no new one, but only a restatement of what had been observed by the ancient commentators on St. Paul's Epistles, that in these Epistles, and, as Dr. Lightfoot shows, in other parts of the New Testament and in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians—the two names "bishop" and "presbyter," are given indifferently to the same persons. It will not be necessary to enlarge upon this, as it has become a commonplace, admitted equally by all schools except from the single point of view of Dr. Harnack, which will be discussed fully in the next paper. Dr. Lightfoot sets forth the biblical evidence at length, and also gives summary references to the patristic (pp. 94–97). It may not be superfluous to note that the commentators of the fourth century, Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, etc. are not guided by a tradition on the subject (for the recollection of the facts seems to have been lost by the end of the second century), but are simply drawing a critical inference, as we might do now.

(2) The next point is, that the identity of the two offices, which is so distinct in the writings of the first century, no longer exists in the Epistles of Ignatius. At the time when his Commentary on Philippians was written, Bp. Lightfoot had doubts as to the full edition of seven letters; but even the shortest form, the three letters preserved in Syriac, made it clear that Ignatius regards the bishop as standing out from among the presbyters and holding a supremacy over them.

(3) There was, however, another series of facts which

showed that the process by which this supremacy was acquired, proceeded at different rates in different Churches. This Dr. Lightfoot traces very carefully by citing a number of witnesses from different parts of the Christian world. Ignatius himself is witness for Antioch, and for the Churches of the province of Asia. He gives us the names at least of two bishops in those parts: Onesimus of Ephesus, and Polycarp of Smyrna. And the fragmentary literature of the end of the second century ascribes the title freely to others. But when we pass over to Macedonia and Greece, the traces of monarchical episcopacy are far more uncertain. The Epistles of Clement to Corinth, and of Polycarp to Philippi, refer only to presbyters and deacons: there are no allusions to the bishop, though, if there had been a bishop, such allusions could hardly have been wanting. At Corinth the rise of monarchical episcopacy falls somewhere between the letter of Clement of Rome and the letter of Dionysius, c. 170 A.D. The latter writer speaks of Quadratus as "bishop" of Athens, probably in the time of Hadrian. In regard to Rome, the data are somewhat complicated. Towards the latter part of the second century we begin to hear of lists of the "bishops of Rome." Such lists are open to suspicion, because the framers of them do not seem to have realized the difference between Apostolic times and their own, and the relations with which they were themselves familiar are antedated. When we go back to the really contemporary literature, the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians gives no indication of an episcopate in the monarchical sense. In regard to Hermas, Bp. Lightfoot speaks hesitatingly. He thinks that the allusions are too vague to lead to any definite result. If he had had the recently discovered *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* before him, I doubt if Dr. Lightfoot would have described the word "bishop" in the enumeration, "aposles, bishops, teachers, and deacons,"

as probably used in its later sense. Elsewhere the constitution of the Church seems to be "presbyteral" (Lightfoot, p. 217, n. 1). And the frequent rebukes of those "who would fain have the first seat," who "are at emulation one with another for the first place or for some honour," seem to give a certain amount of colour to Ritschl's view, that the treatise of Hermas marks the point at which the presbyterian form of government is passing into the episcopal. In Gaul, the first bishop of whom we read is Pothinus, who died in the persecution of 177. Of Africa, before Tertullian, we know practically nothing. At Alexandria, we have the remarkable evidence adduced by Bp. Lightfoot (p. 229), that up to the middle of the third century the bishop was not only nominated by the presbyters from their own number, but also consecrated by them.

It appears then, that though in the early years of the second century the monarchical episcopate was setting in with full sail, it was not yet by any means the universal rule in Christian Churches, and the rate of progress was more rapid in some localities than in others.

(4) So far Bp. Lightfoot's essay is simply a statement of facts, which are in themselves fixed and unalterable, though it may be possible to give a greater or less amount of significance to one here or to another there. The more original portion of the essay consisted in the contribution of a theory.

The problem was how to bridge over the gap between the Pastoral Epistles (not to say Clement of Rome) and Ignatius. In the Pastoral Epistles, "bishop" and "presbyter," are still identical; in the Ignatian Epistles they are certainly distinct. How did this distinction arise? To account for it, Bp. Lightfoot had recourse to a modification of a theory of Rothe's. Rothe brought together certain notices in Eusebius, in a fragment attributed to Irenæus, and in the letter of Clement of Rome; and arguing at

once from these and from the critical position of things in the Church at large, he felt justified in concluding that, after the fall of Jerusalem, a council was held of the surviving apostles and of the first teachers of the gospel, at which a constitution was framed for the Church, the keystone of which was episcopacy.

Rothe however, as Bp. Lightfoot pointed out, pressed his evidence too far. The conclusions which he drew from it were more definite than the evidence itself would really warrant. The council, with its wide-reaching deliberations, was the figment of his imagination. The gradualness with which episcopacy was introduced showed that it could not be due to any single authoritative edict, promulgated at once over the whole Church.

But Rothe was right in the epoch to which he assigned the establishment of the episcopate—the last thirty years of the first century. He was right in the causes to which he referred it—the necessity for greater union among the different Churches, and for some more systematic and concerted action in face of growing dissension, and heresies such as Gnosticism. He was right, lastly, in attributing the change to the agency of the surviving Apostles, especially perhaps St. John. While St. John, in the Churches of Asia Minor, was the prime mover in the formation of the episcopate, the type of which had already been supplied by the presidency of St. James over the college of presbyters at Jerusalem, Ignatius was the great champion of the new order; and it was he who launched it upon that career of increasing strength and importance, which the conflicts with Gnosticism and Montanism conspired to help, and which was finally consummated by the commanding personality and organizing genius of Cyprian.

II. Such was the point at which the question was left by Bp. Lightfoot. Now the history of it as a whole is

instructive as showing how, when a thesis is in the hands of really accomplished scholars, it admits of development which does not imply disturbance of what has gone before. A rash or a slovenly writer makes his statements and his inferences in such a way that they are always needing correction; while accurate statement and circumspect inference leave room for accessions of new knowledge, which fit in and harmonize naturally with the old. Any one may see that the researches of Bp. Lightfoot and Dr. Hatch are quite unconnected with each other. The latter writer is indeed conspicuous amongst the scholars of our time for the independence and originality of his work. He goes back straight to the sources, and rears his whole structure on them. And yet there is a continuity in science which appears sometimes with, but sometimes also without, the consciousness of the individual worker.

Dr. Lightfoot made his starting-point the identity of "bishop" and "presbyter." As to the origin of these two titles, and their relation to contemporary non-Christian institutions, he speaks with great caution. The name "presbyter" indeed was clearly borrowed from the constitution of the Jewish synagogue (p. 190); and if the evidence had been sufficient which went to show that the name ἐπίσκοπος was given to the directors of the religious and social clubs or guilds which were so common in Gentile communities, he would have been disposed to trace the title to that source (p. 192).

This is the side from which the subject was approached by Dr. Hatch, in the Bampton Lectures for 1880. It is not that he added very much to the direct evidence for the use of the word ἐπίσκοπος in connexion with the Gentile associations, but he accumulated a vast amount of evidence, bearing indirectly on the nature of those associations, and drawing out the analogies which they presented to the Christian societies. He turns to us the dark

reverse of the seemingly brilliant civilization of the Roman Empire in the first two centuries. By the side of great display and lavish expenditure, on the part both of municipalities and individuals, there were financial unsoundness, oppressive public debt, grinding taxation, and great distress and suffering among the poor[1] (*Bampton Lectures*, pp. 32–35). Emperors like Trajan sought to alleviate this by founding charitable institutions; but more sustained and more effectual than the efforts of even the best of the emperors was the zealous beneficence of the Christian Church, penetrating into all the chinks and crannies of society, and working on no mechanical and wholesale methods, but with the touch of living and personal sympathy. Of all this Dr. Hatch gives a very graphic picture. We seem to see the Church, like that figure of womanly charity, which painters from Giotto downwards have been so fond of pourtraying, stoop with tender hand to raise the sick and afflicted, minister to the needs and sorrows of the poor, the widow, and the orphan, and hasten to provide food and shelter for the persecuted or wandering brethren.

Out of these societies, Dr. Hatch thinks, grew the use of the term ἐπίσκοπος as a designation of the chief officer in the Church. As it was his duty to distribute, so also was it his duty to receive, the alms and offerings of the people. We learn from Justin Martyr, that these offerings were solemnly made to the presiding officer at the eucharistic service. It was therefore natural and usual, though—as it would appear from the *Didaché*, which speaks of the service as sometimes conducted by the prophets (c. 10 *ad fin.*)—not absolutely necessary that the bishop should preside at these services. This gave him a most

[1] Is there not a slight shade of pessimism in the colouring here? I imagine that Friedländer, Schiller, and Mommsen strike the balance rather differently: see Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte Roms*, ii. p. 3 ff., iii. pp. 98–100 (especially the concluding remarks); Schiller, *Gesch. d. röm. Kaiserzeit*, i. p. 404 ff., 419 ff., 674, etc.

important footing in the central rite of Christian worship, and soon caused it to be assigned definitely to him or to his representative[1] (Ignat. *ad Smyrn.* 8, i.).

In all his functions there was a close connexion between the bishop and the deacons. The common grouping is, bishop and deacons on the one hand, presbyters on the other. The position of the deacons was not so subordinate as it afterwards became. But throughout the changes which have taken place in the functions and status of the three orders, the primitive tradition of the intimate association of bishop and deacon still survived. And it was by virtue of his place as head of the college of deacons that the "*arch*-deacon" became, what he is to this day, the *oculus episcopi*.

If the term ἐπίσκοπος was of Gentile, the term πρεσβύτερος, on the other hand, was of Jewish origin. In this general statement Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Hatch would be agreed; but Dr. Hatch at once traces the roots of the institution farther back, and insists upon a distinction which is apt to be overlooked. The πρεσβύτεροι were not, strictly speaking, officers of the synagogue, but of the συνέδριον, or local court, the constitution of which was parallel to that of the synagogue. This distinction is brought out with great clearness and precision: "It may be gathered from the Talmud that out of the elders or chief men of every community a certain number had come to be officially recognised, and that definite rules were laid down for their action. Side by side with the synagogue of a town, but distinct from it, was the συνέδριον, or local court. The former was the general assembly or 'congregation' of the people; the latter was the 'seat' of the elders. The two institutions were so far in harmony with one another that

[1] I have made use of the *Didaché* to add slightly to what Dr. Hatch has said on this subject (see esp. pp. 39 f., 116). I shall have occasion to return to it later.

the meetings of the local court were held in the synagogue, and that in the meetings of the synagogue for its own proper purposes the elders of the local courts had seats of honour,—the πρωτοκαθεδρίας which our Lord describes the Pharisees as coveting; and hence the word synagogue is sometimes used where the word synedrion would be more exact" (*B. L.* p. 56 f.).

The chief duty which fell to the πρεσβύτεροι was the exercise of discipline. The Romans allowed great liberty to the Jewish communities in this respect, of which they took full advantage. They had indeed all the privileges of self-government. The committee of presbyters formed a point of contact with the Gentile associations, which were also managed by committees. This was the case both with the municipalities and also with the clubs or guilds. And among the Gentiles, as well as among the Jews, the committee bore a name derived from the idea of seniority—γερουσία, and its members were called πρεσβύτεροι.

It has been seen that the functions of the ἐπίσκοπος in receiving and distributing alms, or rather in the exercise of charity in the widest sense, had a special importance, and formed a distinctive feature in the primitive Christian societies; and the same was true of the πρεσβύτερος. The early generations of Christians were truly an *élite*. They set themselves a standard of morality higher than that of the world around them; and it was essential to their very existence that they should live up to this standard. A vigilant watch was kept upon the members of the Church by its officers; and discipline was strictly enforced. After a time, as the Church increased in numbers, as infant baptism became more general, and many were *born* Christians instead of embracing Christianity by a deliberate act, the primitive standard was relaxed; and the question how far it was to be relaxed forms one of the great battle-grounds of the third century. At the end of the first and beginning

of the second century, discipline was administered in all its rigour. And the officers by whom it was administered naturally took a foremost place.

As to the process by which the chief power gradually became concentrated in the hands of the single ἐπίσκοπος, Dr. Hatch takes practically the same view as Bp. Lightfoot. First, there was the tendency which existed throughout the associations of the ancient world for the committee of management to have its president, and to take for president its principal officer, with the corresponding tendency, which is the same at all times, for the powers of the committee to gravitate towards its head. And then, specially in the case of the Christian Church, the controversies of the second century showed that it was necessary to have some one depositary of doctrine. Jerome had long ago pointed out this: "Before factions were introduced into religion by the prompting of the devil," the Churches were governed by a council of elders; "but as soon as each man began to consider those whom he had baptized to belong to himself, and not to Christ, it was decided throughout the world, that one elected from among the elders should be placed over the rest, so that the care of the Church should devolve on him, and the seeds of schism be removed"; and again: "The well-being of the Church depends upon the dignity of the bishop; for if some extraordinary power were not conceded to him by general consent, there would be as many schisms in the Churches as there were priests" (See Lightfoot, p. 204; Hatch, p. 98).

III. Dr. Hatch's Bampton Lectures at once made a marked impression both in England and on the Continent. In England they called forth some hostile criticism[1]; in

[1] Notably in an able, but hasty and, it must be said, distinctly unfair, review in *The Church Quarterly*, vol. xii. p. 409 (July, 1881). It is perhaps worth while, by way of caution, to notice some of the confusions into which the reviewer has fallen. (1) The Bampton lecturer is accused of maintaining the

Germany they met with a more general current of approval. Among the most eminent of those who gave assent to their conclusions was Dr. Harnack, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Giessen (now Marburg), happily not a stranger to the readers of the EXPOSITOR.

Dr. Harnack was so much struck by the lectures that he himself undertook to translate them and present them to German scholars in a German dress. At the same time he added valuable excursuses. This translation was published at Giessen in 1883.

It may have been observed that, in the summary just given, the relation of the ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος is not exactly defined; neither is the process quite made clear by which the ἐπίσκοπος came to appear as president of the Church committee. Dr. Harnack passed this criticism; and he proceeded to supply the want.

In doing so he struck at the root of the assumption made by Bp. Lightfoot, of the practical identity of "bishop" and "presbyter," and the gradual emergence of

"non-essentialness of the Church." He is quoted as appealing to certain well-known passages of Ignatius to prove that "all Christians did not regard membership of the Church as essential" (p. 414). Substitute "*a* Church" for "*the* Church," and the result will be a harmless proposition which will far more truly represent the lecturer's meaning and argument. It was inevitable that in the first beginnings of such a scattered society there should be individual Christians who were, so to speak, "unattached," or members of the Church at large without having joined themselves to any particular local community. (2) The statement that the "alms and oblations" were received by the bishop in the Eucharistic service, is interpreted as if it meant that the Eucharist *itself* "was a means of charitable relief" (p. 421). So it is to this day, in a certain sense. The real question is as to the relation of the Agape to the Eucharist; and of this the reviewer is very far from having disposed in the few sentences that he has given to it. (3) A string of passages is quoted (p. 417) as bearing upon "the functions of the Christian episcopus or presbyter" in the Pastoral Epistles, *every one of which* turns out to have reference neither to episcopus nor to presbyter, but to Timothy and Titus. This is the more strange as the question as to the "episcopal" character of these apostolic delegates had a moment before been expressly set aside. Equally irrelevant are the surrounding pages which dilate on the functions of the Apostles. Of the very mistaken conception of Montanism I shall have occasion to speak later.

the bishop from the presbyteral college. Dr. Hatch had already shown that the two offices were distinct in their origin. Dr. Harnack insists strongly upon this, and denies that at any point in their history they could rightly be identified. He observes that while bishops and deacons are constantly associated together, where these are mentioned presbyters are not mentioned, and *vice versâ*. So in Phil. i. 1, St. Paul gives greeting to the Philippian Church, "with the bishops and deacons." So again in 1 Clem. *ad Cor.* c. 42, the Apostles are represented as appointing bishops and deacons in every city. In the Shepherd of Hermas bishops and deacons on the one hand are kept distinct from presbyters on the other. In 1 Tim. iii. 1–13 there are detailed instructions about bishops and deacons, but presbyters are introduced in a different context (v. 17–19). [This is not an exhaustive enumeration of the passages from the New Testament: we will point out the omissions in the evidence when we come to speak as critics.]

Dr. Harnack accordingly contends that bishop and presbyter represent two distinct forms of organization: the bishop being concerned primarily with the administration of the offerings, therefore also with their reception, and through their reception with public worship; and the presbyter having in the first instance nothing to do with worship, but being responsible for discipline and exercising among Christians a sort of consensual jurisdiction. Dr. Hatch had already laid down this in principle, but Dr. Harnack carries it out with more uncompromising logic,[1] and attempts to trace the distinction in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic literature.

On another side Dr. Hatch's conclusions had been challenged. It was urged that he did not sufficiently

[1] There was something that looked a little like a concession to the older view in *Bamp. Lect.*, p. 38.

account for the prominent part assigned to the bishop in acts of public worship. Dr. Harnack tried to lay somewhat more stress upon this. But it was felt that there was a real gap here in the circle of proof. The materials were insufficient.

Shortly after the appearance of the Hatch-Harnack volume, by a strange piece of good fortune, the missing link seemed to be supplied.

The *Didaché*, or *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, first published by Bryennios at Constantinople towards the end of 1883, seems destined to throw a flood of light on the institutions of the primitive Christianity, and on none more than on the ministry.[1] The first thing that strikes the reader of it will be the prominence that is given to two offices not otherwise largely represented in early literature, those of the apostle (not in the sense in which that term was limited to the Twelve, but as applied to a larger body) and the prophet, while bishop and presbyter, of whom more is usually heard, retreat into the back-ground. In this the *Didaché* links on directly to St. Paul's Epistles. In an additional note to his edition of *The Epistle to the Galatians*, Bp. Lightfoot had done for the name "apostle" what he did in his edition of *The Epistle to the Philippians* for "presbyter" and "bishop." He vindicated for it the wider sense which it already bore besides its traditional limitation to the Twelve, and he restored to their true meaning places like Rom. xvi. 7, where interpreters had been led astray by the

[1] The value of the *Didaché* as a witness to facts is a distinct question from its value as a religious treatise. It seems to me to be more easy to exaggerate the latter than the former, though in this respect too, we must, no doubt, beware of assuming that every usage which it describes was of universal application. From a religious point of view it appears to represent the average common sense of an honestly Christian but not very advanced community with Jewish antecedents or affinities. Into the very interesting investigations of Prof. Warfield and others, as to the history of the *text of* the *Didaché* and its allied documents this is not the place to enter.

usage with which they were most familiar. The name "prophet" was less equivocal. Besides repeated allusions in the Acts, the striking descriptions in 1 Cor. xii., xiv., could leave no doubt as to the part played by the prophets in the primitive Church. In two marked passages, apostles and prophets are placed at the head of the list in an enumeration of ministerial agencies: 1 Cor. xii. 28, "And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healing. . . . Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers?" And again, Eph. iv. 11: "And He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers."

It was clear that at the time when the *Didaché* was written these special forms of Christian activity were still in operation. The apostle and the prophet still hold the foremost place, and next to the prophet comes the teacher. Now it is remarkable that the functions which we should call "spiritual" belong in the first instance to this triad; not only, as it would appear, the preaching of the Word, but the administration of the sacraments. The sacerdotal character belongs to the prophets: "*they are your high priests*" (c. 13). It is not assumed that the prophet will always lead the Eucharistic prayer, but there is an express provision that, if he does so, he is not to be confined to any set form, but is to be allowed to give thanks as he will (c. 10 *ad fin.*). In comparison with the prophets and teachers, bishops and deacons occupy a secondary place; they are in danger of being overlooked, and enjoy a lower grade of honour. And yet they too have a share in the services of the Church, and particularly in the Eucharist. For the regulations in regard to these are immediately followed by instructions as to the appointment of bishops and deacons: "Appoint therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men that are meek and

not covetous, and truthful and approved; *for they too perform for you the service of the prophets and teachers. Therefore neglect them not; for they are your honoured ones together with the prophets and teachers*" (c. 15).

Dr. Harnack was not slow to grasp the significance of this weighty passage. In his edition of the *Didaché* he works it out with his usual boldness and penetration. There were originally two forms or classes of ministry in the Church. The apostles, prophets, and teachers belonged to the one; the bishops, deacons, and presbyters to the other. The work of teaching, exhorting, preaching the word of God, leading in public worship, fell at least primarily to the first; administration, in all its branches, fell to the second.

Corresponding to this difference of function is a difference of *status*. Apostles, prophets, and teachers received the gift which they exercised by direct supernatural endowment. They were appointed by God, not by man (1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11). They were not nominated to any one locality, but wandered to and fro, as they would, in the Church at large. Words signifying "election" or "appointment" (*χειροτονεῖν*,[1] *καθιστάνειν*) are not used of them. On the other hand, bishops, deacons, and presbyters are appointed to some particular Church. They belong specially to that Church. They are stationary: they

[1] *χειροτονεῖν* originally meant to "elect by show of hands," hence simply to "elect" or "appoint." In the fourth century it had come to be equivalent to *χειροθετεῖν*, and the two words are frequently confused in the MSS. The question as to the "laying on of hands" is not one into which we need enter at present, as the theories that we are discussing are not affected by it either way. The exact nature and intention of this rite is a distinct question from that as to the origin and affinities of the offices to which it was applied. Most of the passages from the New Testament that are quoted in connexion with it have reference to the bestowal of extraordinary gifts or extraordinary commissions, but that does not prevent it from being associated with the regular and more formal ministry. The subject is one of deep interest, to which I shall probably return at a later stage.

do not move about from place to place: they have not the duties of missionaries.

But though there is this clear distinction between the two classes, they are not separated from each other by any impassable barrier. In the apostolic age the condition of things is still fluid. There would frequently be cross-divisions between the different offices. There was nothing to prevent a bishop, or a presbyter, or a deacon from possessing the gift of prophecy, or teaching. The Pastoral Epistles clearly imply, both that some might possess it, and that others did not. "Let the elders (presbyters) that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially those who labour in the word and in teaching" (1 Tim. v. 17). Evidently there were some who taught as well as ruled, and others who ruled only. It is well that a bishop should be "apt to teach" (1 Tim. iii. 2), and "to exhort in sound doctrine."

Besides this, the first supernatural impulse would be gradually withdrawn. The enthusiastic age of the Church must come to an end. And it would not be possible to draw a sharp line where it ended. Ordinary gifts would, after a time, take the place of extraordinary. The *Didaché* distinctly contemplates the case that a Church would have no prophet in its midst. In that case the offerings that would have been given to him are to go to the poor (c. 13). But the absence of a prophet did not necessarily suspend all the services of the Church. In default of a prophet the bishops and deacons were to take them. That seems to be the meaning of the phrase, "for they too perform for you the service (λειτουργίαν) of the prophets and teachers."

Here we have the key to the whole position. It was inevitable that by degrees the standing officers of the community would attract to themselves the powers and prerogatives which the extraordinary ministry vacated. The visits of the prophet would become few and far between; and

insensibly bishop, deacons, and presbyters would step into his place. What was at first the exception would pass into the rule. The services of the Church would be conducted by the bishop and his coadjutors, not only when there was no prophet or teacher present to conduct them, but as a regular thing.

The peculiar value of the *Didaché* consists in this, that it reveals to us the process in the moment of transition. It brings down the bird, as it were, upon the wing. The sentence which I italicized a page or two back explains why the permanent officials of the Christian Churches did not possess at first all the functions which they possessed later, and how they came to acquire them. They did not possess them, because the more prosaic duties which they themselves discharged were supplemented by that extraordinary wave of spiritual exaltation which swept over the whole of the primitive Church. In that age the wish of Moses was well-nigh fulfilled, that "all the Lord's people were prophets." The difficulty was not to incite to the attainment of such gifts, but to regulate and control them. One by one they became rarer, and disappeared. The apostolate was the first to go. Prophecy lasted until it was finally discredited by Montanism. The class of teachers survived still longer into the third century; indeed, it would hardly be wrong to regard the Catechetical School of Alexandria as a systematizing of this office, with learning and philosophy substituted for the primitive enthusiasm.

I must not make Dr. Harnack responsible for the exact form in which I have stated his theory. I imagine that in accounting for the gradual transference of powers from the wandering possessors of extraordinary inspiration to the regular officers of the local Churches, I have laid a little more stress than he has done on the *stationary* and *permanent* character of the latter. Instead of this, he speaks of it as "lying in the nature of the administrative and patri-

archal office, that it should draw away from others, and draw to itself the ministry of the Word"; a *sequitur* that I am not sure that I quite understand. However this may be, the main position is certainly his. He emphasizes forcibly the fact that bishops and deacons did discharge the duties of teachers and prophets; and he rightly seizes on this as the turning-point in the development of the Christian ministry to its later forms. If, in reproducing his argument, I have slightly altered any of its proportions, it is entirely from data which Dr. Harnack has himself supplied.

I have before referred to the way in which new matter fits in with old, where the old has been carefully sifted and digested, and it is only fair to point out that many of the elements of the theory elaborated by Dr. Harnack with the help of the *Didaché*, are already to be found in the works of his predecessors. Bp. Lightfoot defines with great clearness the difference between the functions of the apostle and the bishop. "The apostle," he says, "like the prophet or the evangelist, held no *local* office. He was essentially, as his name denotes, a missionary, moving about from place to place, founding and confirming new brotherhoods" (*Philippians*, p. 194). Again, in reference to the presbyters or bishops, he says: "Though *government* was probably the first conception of the office, yet the work of *teaching* must have fallen to the presbyters from the very first, and have assumed greater prominence as time went on. *With the growth of the Church, the visits of the apostles and evangelists to any individual community must have become less and less frequent, so that the burden of instruction would be gradually transferred from these missionary preachers to the local officers of the congregation.* Hence, St. Paul in two passages, where he gives directions relating to bishops or presbyters, insists specially on the faculty of teaching as a qualification for the position. *Yet even here*

this work seems to be regarded rather as incidental to, than as inherent in the office. . . . There is no ground for supposing that the work of teaching and the work of governing pertained to separate members of the presbyteral college. As each had his special gift, so would he devote himself more or less exclusively to one or the other of these sacred functions" (*Ibid.* pp. 192, 193). Putting the *Didaché* for a moment out of sight, is it not remarkable how nearly the conclusions which it suggests are anticipated? Dr. Hatch is even more explicit in the way in which he insists on the separability of teaching from administration. "It is clear that the presbyters of the primitive Churches did not necessarily teach. They were not debarred from teaching, but if they taught as well as ruled they combined two offices. In the numerous references to presbyters in sub-apostolic literature there is not one to their being teachers, even where a reference might have been expected; as for example in the enumeration of the duty of presbyters which is given by Polycarp in the form of an exhortation to fulfil them" (*B. L.*, p. 76). Dr. Hatch adds to this, that the presbyters, as such, took no part in the Eucharistic service. "They probably had no more than the place which the Jewish presbyters had in the synagogue—seats of honour and dignity, but no official part in the service" (p. 78). The bishops, it is true, *had* such a part; they received the offerings which were distributed by the deacons. Hence there was the more reason why, in the absence of the prophet, they should take the lead throughout. It is easy to understand how both these scholars must have felt that the *Didaché* put into their hands the very clue for which they were seeking.

In the case of Dr. Harnack the *Didaché* supplied something more than a temporary stimulus. As I am writing, there comes into my hands a new part of the valuable *Texte und Untersuchungen*, edited by Dr. Harnack jointly

with O. von Gebhardt, in which so many of the problems of early Christian literature are receiving a critical examination. In this latest part (Band II. Heft 5) Dr. Harnack continues an investigation which he had begun of the composition and contents of the *Apostolic Ordinances* (*Αἱ διαταγαὶ αἱ διὰ Κλήμεντος καὶ κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων*, sometimes called the *Apostolic Canons*, to be carefully distinguished from the *Apostolic Constitutions*). This work is analysed into its component parts, one of them consisting of a considerable portion of the *Didaché*. Two more of these parts are now subjected to a close examination. They are both dated about 140–180 A.D., and they are found to contain some important statements.

(1) The order in which the several offices are mentioned is unusual and remarkable: bishop, presbyters, *reader*, deacons. This appears to be the only instance in which the reader is placed above the deacons, in the ranks of the higher clergy; he is usually numbered among the lower orders—subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, doorkeepers.

(2) The bishop appears in the character of *ποιμήν*, "shepherd" of his flock; it is a necessary qualification that he must be *φιλόπτωχος*, "a friend of the poor," which points to his administration of the alms; he represents the community to the outside world; and he takes the lead in the services of the Church, which begin to be described in language taken from the "mysteries." There are some important statements as to the election of bishops, with which however we need not at present be concerned.

(3) The presbyters are two in number (the *Apostolic Ordinances* in its present form has *three*, but Dr. Harnack shows that the number in the original document must have been *two*; I quite agree with his reasoning on this point). They must be advanced in age; they form the council of the bishop, with especial charge of discipline; they also take part with him as his *συμμυσταί*, in the Eucharistic

service, in regard to which some interesting particulars are given.

(4) The number of the deacons has dropped out, but appears to have been originally three. They are to mix with the congregation, and must be persons of tact and temper, not regarding the rich more than the poor, with skill in inciting to secret deeds of charity, privately admonishing those who are inclined to be disorderly.

(5) The reader (*ἀναγνώστης*, *lector*) has a peculiar importance in this document. Besides the natural qualifications of a reader, he must be *διηγητικός*, "apt in exposition," for which the reason is assigned that he "does the business of an evangelist" (*εἰδὼς ὅτι εὐαγγελιστοῦ τόπον ἐργάζεται*). We are reminded at once of the passage in the *Didaché*, where bishops and deacons are described as "performing the service of the prophets and teachers." Dr. Harnack sees in this another trace of the process by which the extraordinary "gifts of the Spirit" gradually gave place to the formal appointment of regular officials. The "evangelist" had belonged to the class of "gifted" persons; and the reader had originally belonged to the same class. In further confirmation of this, Dr. Harnack adduces an ancient prayer of consecration, preserved in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 22), which invokes upon him "the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of prophecy." As the bishop, presbyters, and deacons rose in the scale, the possessors of the extraordinary gifts sank lower in it. The reader's is now being constituted into a permanent office: he may still be called upon to "preach" or "expound" (*διηγητικός*); and Dr. Harnack finds an example of a sermon delivered by a reader in what is commonly called the Second Epistle of Clement of Rome (c. 19, 1). By the third century these higher functions were lost, and the readership was reduced to the merely mechanical office of reading the lessons.

These are a few of the points in Dr. Harnack's latest

contribution to the subject, which add some finishing touches to the theory which I have been describing. I must now take leave of it for the present. In the next paper I hope to offer something in the way of criticism, and to speak more directly in my own person.

W. SANDAY.

CANON WESTCOTT.

THE Church of England has witnessed, within the last four or five years, an almost total subsidence of the vehement internal controversies which, forty, five and twenty, or even fifteen years ago, divided large portions of it into two or three bitterly hostile parties. And while this change of feeling has been felt to modify the methods of the Church's practical work—while its social, pastoral, and missionary activity has gained whatever it can gain from more united action—the change has affected the field of purely theological study too. The greatest Anglican theologian of the former generation was popularly made the eponymus of a party, and as such was denounced by many who knew nothing, and defended by many who knew hardly anything, of the real greatness of his writings, character, and influence; friends and enemies staked his reputation upon his disputed orthodoxy, not on his unquestioned learning. The greatest theologians of the present generation have a reputation and an influence based upon their learning in the first instance. Their orthodoxy has no doubt contributed to their popularity among the orthodox, but it is their intellectual eminence that has won respect for them, not their personal charm nor their advocacy of certain opinions; and it is when the strife of opinion is quieted, that the respect felt for them is most fully realized.

In Canon Westcott's case, this extra-controversial tone and position is more noticeable, because the subject-matter of many of his works is in one sense controversial. From the internal controversies of Christians he stands aside, or refers to them, if at all, in the tone of a moderator rather than of a partisan; but with all the sober and dispassionate tone of his books on Scripture, one feels that he is never far from the attitude of an apologist—that he cannot write about the history of the Bible, and can hardly write about the central doctrines of the Christian faith, without remembering that the Bible and the Faith are liable to attack from without, for which he and his readers have to be prepared beforehand.

Something is lost, no doubt, by this constant apologetic attitude: but more is gained by what makes it unavoidable. When George III. said that "the Bible needed no Apology," his protest perhaps came from a sound devotional instinct, as much as from ignorance of the history of the word; but in our days a man who treats the truth of the Gospel as unquestionable has to live in a world of his own, which, however much better than the great world of intellectual movement, is smaller and quite different from it. If a man lives in that great world, it is quite possible for him to hold the Christian faith. To ignore it as refuted, and to pass it by, is almost as narrowing and much less strengthening to the mind than to assume it as axiomatic: but the man who lives in the main stream of thought can do neither. Whether he be a believer or not, he cannot but remember that some competent thinkers differ from him; and therefore he cannot afford to leave out of memory the grounds which justify his differing from them.

Now Dr. Westcott's great merit as a theologian is this: that he has lived and does live in the great world and not in a little one, in the main stream of intellectual life, not in

a back-water or a side eddy. In theology, as in other sciences, there is in our time a danger (first perhaps pointed out by Dr. Arnold) of specialism and excessive division of labour; a man who is nothing but a biblical critic, an ecclesiastical historian, or a dogmatic theologian, cannot treat even his own subject as satisfactorily as the man who is all three. Still more, it is a fatal disadvantage for a preacher or Church administrator to be behind the age in information—to take things for granted that his hearers will not grant, to ignore questions that they are asking, and to treat as of self-evident importance objects to which they are indifferent. And from these evils a many-sided man like Dr. Westcott is secure. Perhaps an extreme instance, and not the least admirable, of this many-sidedness, is shown by his publication of the *Paragraph Psalter*—an edition of the Psalms pointed for use in Peterborough Cathedral. Englishmen are accustomed to recognise that Cathedrals ought to have good musical services; they are beginning to recognise also that Cathedral endowments are not useless, if given to good theologians. But we usually treat it as inevitable, that there shall be a hard and fast line between the Canons who preach and write on theology and the Minor Canons who chant the services; we are taken by surprise, but we ought to be only the more grateful, when the pointing of the Psalter for chanting is regulated not by a mere musician, but by a man who reads the Psalter as a scholar and divine. One asks whether it be not possible to return to the days when a member of a religious and learned body might be expected to be *in pleno cantu mediocriter doctus*—when some knowledge of music formed part of a liberal, still more of a clerical, education—and when the Precentor of a Cathedral was almost the highest in rank of its members. Peterborough Cathedral, like others of the New Foundation, does not make this claim upon one of its dignitaries; it

is the more honour to one of them to have done the work which was not demanded by the title of his office.

But while the *Paragraph Psalter* stands somewhat apart from the rest of Dr. Westcott's works, it is difficult to classify these, for the reason already given—that few or none of them belong to one branch of theological study to the exclusion of others. Of course the edition of St. John's Gospel, originally issued as part of the *Speaker's Commentary*, and that of St. John's Epistles, may be ranked as purely exegetical, and so form a class by themselves; so do the works which, within the last five years, have brought Dr. Westcott's name most into public notice among those who are not students—his share in the edition of a critical text of the New Testament, and his consequent influence in the Revised English Version of it. But among his other works, though we may draw a line between on the one hand the *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, the *History of the Canon*, and *The Bible in the Church*, and perhaps the *History of the English Bible;* and on the other the *Gospel of the Resurrection*, the *Revelation of the Risen Lord*, and such series of sermons as *The Christian Life, manifold and one*, *Steps in Christian Life*, *The Revelation of the Father*, and the recent *Christus Consummator*, the line is anything but a sharp one. There are works like the *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*, and *The Historic Faith*, which might almost with equal propriety be assigned to either of the two last groups; and it would be hard to give a description of either which would not include, for instance, *Christus Consummator*.

I. The first of Westcott's publications was *Elements of Gospel Harmony*, the Norrisian Essay in 1851. This was recast in 1860 as an *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, but despite the change of title, the numbering of the editions of this book recognises the work of 1851 as the first edition; though in that of 1860, as is said in

the Preface, "everything is changed in detail, nothing in principle." And the *continuity* of the author's mental life is well illustrated by the history of this book—by the fact that he had no change "in principle" to make or record in the eventful thirty years between 1851 and 1881, but that changes in detail, sufficient to bring the work up to date in view of successive discoveries or theories, were compatible with maintenance of the original thesis or point of view. Indeed, the original thesis of this early work is one lying at the base of several of the later ones. It is namely, that though the Gospels are not—even when all four are combined—adequate materials for what is called a Harmony, for a biography in chronological order, they yet are not only adequate for their actual purpose as a Revelation, but are trustworthy, though incomplete, as historical documents. Now what is here stated of the Gospels as wholes is just what, in 1881, is made to explain the view of the "Revelation of the Risen Lord," in which the Gospels culminate: "That which is incomplete as a history is complete as a Gospel" (*Revelation*, etc., p. 6).

And if we regard the *Elements of Gospel Harmony* as being, in its original form, a comparatively immature work, the *History of the New Testament Canon*, which dates only four years later, is even more striking an instance of all that we have said—of the author's ability to recognise beforehand what it has taken the world thirty years to learn, so that he is not led by the lessons of these years to change the position that he took up thirty years ago. I have compared in detail throughout the first and the latest edition of this book; and here more than anywhere one feels, on the one hand the soundness of the insight which on a partial view of the evidence came to the judgment which a completer view verifies, and on the other the merit of the patient industry, which has noticed and even recorded, not only the new evidence, but the new argu-

ments which have been brought to bear on the matter, and which yet have not materially modified the view originally taken.

Nor is this less illustrative of what we said at the outset—that Dr. Westcott at once is an apologist, and is not a controversialist. In the edition of 1875 there were introduced, and in the later one there still stand, replies to the strictures of the author of *Supernatural Religion*—a writer who can hardly be said to be forgotten now, but who is felt to have deserved a good deal less than the reputation which he got when his book first appeared. Now it is noticeable how very much more respectfully this writer is treated by Canon Westcott than by Bishop Lightfoot or Professor Salmon. Partly this may be ascribed to the fact that he had pointed his charges against "apologists" by some criticisms on Dr. Westcott's own book, which the latter felt bound not to seem to resent personally; but it is a sign of an habitual temper disinclined to critical severity, when a man forced into controversy with such an author treats him with such respect. Almost the only point for which he is blamed is the extraordinary inaccuracy, which survived even after the corrections of the second edition.

The *History of the Canon*, good and solid as it is within its limits, had this defect in its original form, that it scarcely dealt with any periods except those which fell within the range of common study. Ecclesiastical history means, to the average English ecclesiastical student, the history of the first five centuries and of the Reformation: they vaguely suspect that, in the thousand years between those limits, the Church was not in the blessed state of having no history, and they know that, in the three hundred years since, their own Church at least has had a varied and eventful one; but they never realize that mediæval or modern Church history may be as theologically significant as primi-

tive. Now for the special subject of the *History of the Canon*, it is comparatively harmless to confine the view to the first four centuries and the sixteenth, because there was no other time, till the present century, when Christian thought was actively concerned with the question. Still it is an improvement when, in *The Bible in the Church*, and in later editions of the *History of the Canon*, the age of the Reformation is treated fully, and the ages before and after it are not ignored. It is a more doubtful gain when, in *The Bible in the Church*, the scope of the work is extended so as to take in the history of the Old Testament Canon as well as the New. Of course a theological scholar like Dr. Westcott may be trusted to know what is known on subjects which, like Rabbinical literature, are not specially his own; but such secondary knowledge is not sufficient to enable one to close questions that are in any way open. One would need extensive knowledge of Rabbinical literature at first hand, to judge whether Palestinian or Eastern Jews never treated the work of the Son of Sirach as canonical; while if the question be thrown further back, and we ask when and how the notion of a Canon of Scripture first arose, we have really no adequate materials for a scientific answer at all. What scanty evidence we have is ambiguous, unless a rare degree of knowledge could throw an altogether fresh light upon it. For instance, the story in 2 Maccabees about Nehemiah "founding a library," is at least as easily to be understood as a description of the compilation of the Book of Chronicles (including Ezra) as of the collection or "canonization" of the Hagiographa. In order to tell us authoritatively which is likely to be meant, a writer must know more than is generally known; if he knows nothing to decide the point, it is scarcely worth while to repeat the common conjectural interpretation.

The *History of the English Bible*, first published in 1868,

is perhaps the least interesting and most disappointing of the author's works. It is well done, but a weaker man could have done it as well; and it may be doubted whether the precise thing which it does was worth doing. To any one who wishes really to study the successive modifications of the text, it does not supersede the English Hexapla; and to any one who does not, the subject seems a minute one, and the book not worth reading. Tyndale's own life is an interesting one: his character and opinions, and Coverdale's too, are of importance as illustrating the real moral influences at work in the history of the Reformation; but here these are only treated allusively and incidentally; and we do not feel either that the author's estimate of their work as translators is all we need to know, or that the specimens given of their work are enough to enable us to verify or criticise his estimate.

II. In Dr. Westcott's contributions to dogmatic or (if we may use the term) speculative theology, there are two main tendencies of thought, the predominance of one or other of which makes them fall into two groups. In the *Gospel of the Resurrection* (1866), the *Revelation of the Risen Lord* (1881), and the *Historic Faith* (1883), the prominent thought is the historical Christ, Christ as revealed on earth; while in the *Revelation of the Father* (1884), and *Christus Consummator* (1886), it is rather the Eternal Word, by Whom and for Whom all things were created, Whose Incarnation, or the knowledge of God which it makes possible, is regarded as the key to all the problems of the universe.

It seems irreverent, or at least impertinent, to criticise books like these, which are not only devoutly written, but are suggestive and stimulative of devout thought, so that they ought to be read rather in a devotional than a critical temper. Perhaps the one that most challenges criticism is the *Gospel of the Resurrection*. We may say that this is

because it is the earliest of the author's works of this class: not meaning that it is less mature or well considered than the later, but that it deals with a state of mind which, though common twenty years ago, has not proved permanent, and probably did not deserve to be so. In matters of scholarship, biblical or otherwise, Dr. Westcott has always stood ahead of his readers, and an advance in the general standard of knowledge has done nothing to discredit him; but it is less certain that in psychology or metaphysics his judgment is more than that of an average educated man of his time. Now, such a man twenty years ago was apt to think the eternity of matter inconceivable, and the existence of a personal God a necessity of thought; but people whose minds are active, and who know what the movement of men's mind is and has been, now know that materialism, pantheism, and atheism are things which, right or wrong, it is at least possible for serious thinkers to believe. And the incapacity here shown to do justice to the materialist point of view is the more surprising, because it is recognised how arbitrary is the line popularly drawn between "soul" and "body." He who feels how hard it is to draw this line should have felt how rash it is to assume that we *feel* something intuitively, because we *believe* it undoubtingly. To say that we have intuitive knowledge of the existence of our own souls, or the freedom of our own will, may be a true or a misleading description of the facts of consciousness; but it is at least certain that the facts so described are given in consciousness, and can be denied by no one. It is further a tenable though not an incontestable view, that we are directly conscious, as of the power to choose either a right or wrong course of action, so of responsibility for choosing the right—*i.e.* that the individual subject is intuitively conscious of its subordination to the universal order—to the Power, whatever it be, that is supreme in the universe. But it is not a part of this consciousness, even if it be a

legitimate inference from it or from other data, that the universal or supreme Power is itself a conscious Subject, in Whose image the human consciousness is made. That it is so is the postulate of Christian theology—perhaps of anything to be called a theology as distinct from mere metaphysics; and a Christian theologian may be excused in taking it for granted, when dealing only with fellow-Christians. But he weakens instead of strengthening his theological system, when he rests this postulate of theology not on what may be true reasonings, but on a false appeal to consciousness. And accordingly we find that in this group of Dr. Westcott's works the best are those which, being actually series of sermons, or at least framed in the form of sermons, are addressed to Christians—not necessarily to perfectly convinced Christians, but to men who may be presumed to be willing to hear what is said from the Christian point of view, without challenging that point of view as untenable. *The Revelation of the Risen Lord* and *Christus Consummator* are in this way far more satisfactory works than the *Gospel of the Resurrection*. In the former of these the scantiness of the purely historical evidence is in some sort admitted and accounted for, while in the *Gospel of the Resurrection* the statement of the evidence is less satisfactory than the working out of the significance of the doctrine. These later works do not treat the postulate of Christianity as a theorem to be proved; but perhaps they do something more than assume it—they show that the assumption can be verified, and that it is a guide to other truths that would be unknown without it.

III. Perhaps the works in which one feels Dr. Westcott's strength most fully shown are the exegetical ones—the commentary on St. John's Gospel and the edition of his Epistles. Here we feel especially the advantage of a man being at once a reverent theologian and a critical scholar, not a mere specialist in either abstract theology or verbal

criticism. And the Essays appended to the Epistles have all the merits of Dr. Westcott's theology—except to some extent that of practical application. In that on the "Two Empires—the Church and the World," it is something to have the situation in St. John's day stated candidly, and not to find Nero or Domitian treated as an average specimen of pagan morals or pagan power; but we are disappointed when nothing is said of "the world in the Church"—of the opposition that still exists, unavowed and perhaps less intense, but not less real, between the nominally Christian world and the really Christian Church.

The Essay on "The Gospel of Creation," like *Christus Consummator*, deals with the important principle, that primitive and catholic theology does not regard the doctrine of Atonement as the whole of the Gospel, but regards the knowledge of the Son of God, and of the Father through Him, as an end in itself, distinct from the redemption from sin which the Father has sent the Son to effect. But it is one thing to recognise that redemption was not the only purpose, or the only effect, of the Incarnation, and another thing to say that the Son of God *would* have been incarnate if there had been no Fall, and so no need of a Redemption. If the matter be put this way, we feel there is some presumption in saying what God *would* have done if things had been different from what they are. It is an inadequate conception of His action to regard it as contingent or modified by circumstances; and as this forbids us to say that if man had acted differently, God would not have done what He has, so it hardly allows us to say that if man had acted differently, God still would have done the same. God has done what He has; and He did it in fulfilment of an eternal purpose—a purpose formed in His eternal knowledge of what man would do and now has done; we cannot say that the purpose depended on the knowledge, but it never existed without it.

And one deduction must be made from Dr. Westcott's almost perfect qualifications as an expositor of Scripture. The man who reads it both critically and theologically has a temptation not identical with that of the merely verbal critic, but like it; being accustomed to bring knowledge of one study to throw light upon another, he learns to overvalue the light so thrown. Dr. Westcott seldom or never, indeed, attempts to settle a critical question by theological considerations; but he is less free from a tendency to draw theological or at least exegetical inferences from grammatical minutiæ, which we may be sure were not present to the minds of the New Testament writers. Thus in St. John, Ep. I. i. 5, *σκοτία οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ οὐδεμία*, he says, "The form of the negative sentence is remarkable. . . . The double negative is lost in the Latin, *tenebræ in eo non sunt ullæ*." Surely here the difference is one simply between the idiom of the two languages. *οὐκ ἔστιν* would be literally translated by *non sunt*, though the one verb is singular and the other plural, and *οὐκ ἔστιν . . . οὐδεμία* is just as literally translated by *non sunt ullæ*. Again, in *Christus Consummator*, near the end of the first sermon, we are told that the simple verb *γινώσκωσιν* in St. John xvii. 3 implies "know with a knowledge which is extended from generation to generation and from day to day." Such overtranslation is in a schoolboy a fault on the right side; but when a scholar like Dr. Westcott does it, we can only say that we see the disadvantage of giving to professors the work that should be done by schoolmasters—that they do not leave behind what may safely be forgotten by those who are past the schoolboy stage. The fact that such details as these cannot be dwelt on in a commentary for English readers as much as in notes on a Greek text, does not a little to make Dr. Westcott's notes on the Gospel more satisfactory to read than those on the Epistles; though there is perhaps here and there more power, and more

suggestive matter for thought, in the latter than in the former.

IV. It is difficult to speak fairly of Dr. Westcott's share in the critical text of the New Testament published by him and Dr. Hort. The latter did those parts of the joint work which put his personality most *en évidence;* and he gives, far more frequently than his colleague, notes signed with his own initial, putting forward individual opinion on a point where the two were not able to agree. So far as these notes enable us to distinguish between the two editors, we get the impression that Dr. Westcott worked in the more sober and patient spirit, with more candid recognition of the uncertainty that remains when critical science has done its best. But in other works he has indicated opinions on some critical points which we can hardly suppose him to have abandoned, and which, if not, imply that he does not absolutely concur with all that Dr. Hort says in his Introduction. In the *History of the Canon*, and in the *Bible in the Church*, it is inferred from the list of books, including St. Clement and not Hermas, that Cod. A was of Syrian rather than Alexandrian origin; while Dr. Hort says (§ 348 of Introduction) that the evidence, "such as it is, suggests that A and C were connected with Alexandria." A more important difference is, that while Dr. Hort considers the "fundamental text" of ℵ to be "free from Western or Alexandrian elements" (Introd., § 205), and though allowing that "the Western readings are specially numerous in St. John's Gospel" (*ibid.*), yet speaks of "the fundamental similarity of text . . . throughout the whole of ℵ with the exception of the Apocalypse" (§ 352), Dr. Westcott, in his Introduction to St. John's Gospel (V. 1, p. xc. in the original edition of the *Speaker's Commentary*), couples ℵ with D and the Old Syriac and Old Latin Versions, *i.e.* regards it as giving mainly an ancient "Western" text. It would not follow from this, that he disagreed from

his colleague as to the exceptionally high value of the combination B ℵ; but we cannot feel sure how far he would agree with the reasoning on which that high estimate is based by him.

But it is idle to speculate about the respective share of the two editors in the merits or weaknesses of what they have agreed to give forth as their joint work: and it would be an inadequate account of the work of Dr. Westcott's life which refrained from estimating the edition of the New Testament because it is not his work exclusively. For the plainest, perhaps the greatest, of its faults, it is likely enough that neither of the editors was responsible, but the publishers. The book is either too large or too small, tells us too little or too much. No one would complain if they had given us a work like the first volume by itself —a text which they believe to be the soundest now attainable, with alternative readings in cases which they regard as doubtful, and a very brief outline of their principles of criticism. But when they do more than this—when they set forth at some length their theory of the history of the text, and the grounds for it—when they discuss in full detail some of the interesting points that they have to decide—then we have a right to ask that they shall not pass over other points as interesting; that they shall at least show us how their theory works in representative cases. On every page we see that the editors must have asked themselves half a dozen questions and answered them; and just because we know their opinion to be weighty, we demand that they shall show us, not the bare answer, but how and why they arrived at it. There is something indeed to be said against obtruding on the average student a complete *apparatus critici*, in which one cannot see the wood for the trees; whether this be given or no, there is at any rate much to be said for giving him such a summary of the evidence as *e.g.* that on Matt. viii.

28, "Γερασηνῶν Western (? Gr. Lat. Syr. Eg.); Γεργεσηνῶν Alexandrian and Syrian (Gr. Eg. Æth. Arm. Goth.)." But if we are to have such a summary of the evidence, it ought to be at least twice or thrice as full as it is. "The list (of select readings) might," we are told, "without any serious difference of purpose have been made much longer": and why was it not? "The list was not intended to have any completeness except in respect of the more important or interesting readings." But is not the ternary variation in Luke x. 41–2 both important and interesting? And here, moreover, we know from Dr. Scrivener (*Plain Introduction*, p. 595, ed. 1883) that the editors have actually changed their opinion. We expect them, then, to tell us both what their definite opinion is and why, and why they were once almost convinced of a different one. We hunger for information which the editors must have, not only in their heads but in their desks. When they have spent twenty-five years in the labour of study and thought, we complain of their having grudged us the few hours' labour of transcribing the result—unless, indeed, it was Messrs. Macmillan that grudged them paper and type.

The same complaint of inadequacy applies to the Introduction as to the Appendix; if it had been longer, it could have avoided the excessively abstract method, the barrenness of definite instances, which makes the earlier part of it all but impossible to read, and the latter impossible to test or verify, except to some one who is willing to study the subject almost as thoroughly as the editors themselves. It is said that Dr. Burgon's trenchant reviews did much to check the circulation of this edition, as well as of the Revised Version of the New Testament; and unfortunate as this result is, it was largely Dr. Hort's fault—or his publishers'. He, whether with or without the excuse of want of room, gives us barely seven or eight instances of "neutral" readings that approve themselves as right;

Dr. Burgon gave dozens, and marshalled a vast show of evidence on each, where he thought them wrong; and the public concluded that he could, and Dr. Hort could not, give concrete reasons for his general view; and that therefore his was the view of common sense, Westcott and Hort's of crotchety doctrinaires.

And though any one who has seriously and dispassionately studied the purely critical question will be inclined to think the exact reverse, this would be unjust to the Dean of Chichester. As against the Revised Version, he really had a case; he only damaged it by "abusing the defendant's attorney," which character he rightly or wrongly ascribed to Dr. Hort. If we admit that Westcott and Hort interpret the evidence rightly, the "neutral text" represents what the Apostles and Evangelists wrote; and they are right in printing that text in a critical edition. But on their own showing no less than on Dr. Burgon's, the so-called "Syrian text"—with or without the pre-Syrian elements preserved in the Latin Vulgate, and the late glosses embodied in mediæval and modern editions of the latter—is the text which the Church has received; and it is a question, not of pure criticism but rather of practical theology, whether the Church is not bound to retain what she has received, even when she knows that it is not what was originally written. It is really a reasonable view, that as the human authors of the New Testament were guided by the Holy Spirit, so were its human editors; that, *e.g.* though St. Luke wrote neither the story of the man working on the Sabbath, nor the exact words of the rebuke to the sons of Zebedee at the Samaritan village, it was a sound, or even a Divine and infallible instinct, by which the one is rejected, and the other accepted, as authentic words of the Master, worthy to be inserted in the Gospel. If so, a critical edition is right in giving both, if at all, in the margin; but a version for popular use has no right

to banish the second from the text. From this point of view, even 1 St. John v. 7 is not indefensible. St. John did not write it, but the Western Church for twelve centuries, and practically the whole Church for three, has accepted it as harmonizing well with what he did write; and in view of the Church's acceptance it is rash to deny that it is a relevant as well as an orthodox gloss, rightly appended for popular use to the text.

W. H. SIMCOX.

THE PROPHETESS DEBORAH.

THE history of Israel is a history of prophecy, a history in which men of prophetic rank and name stand at the great turning points of the people's life and direct the movements. And the inner progress of the people was throughout guided by prophets, who fertilized the religious life of the nation with new thoughts, or nourished the seeds of truth and the higher aspirations already planted in the heart of the people, into fuller growth and fruitfulness; and who, especially in the many crises of the nation's history, prepared for the crisis by revealing truths regarding God which enabled the people to encounter the storm without sinking beneath it, as, for example, at the time of the destruction of the State.

It is the conviction of the prophets and writers of Israel that the line of prophetic teachers has been unbroken since the days of Moses. Jeremiah brings Moses and Samuel together: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before Me, yet My mind could not be toward this people; cast them out of My sight, and let them go forth" (xv. 1). And elsewhere he speaks in the name of the Lord: "Since the day

that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day, I have sent unto you all My servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them" (vii. 25). And the representation of Amos is similar: "I brought you up out of the land of Egypt, and led you forty years through the wilderness; . . . and I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazirites" (ii. 10, 11). The Nazirites were a class dating very far back; we find illustrious examples of them in Samson and Samuel in the time of the Judges, and no doubt there were prophets contemporary with them, though, with the exception of the prophetess Deborah, they are only incidentally mentioned (Jud. vi. 8) till the time of Samuel.[1]

To say that the history of Israel is a history of her prophets is to say that it is a history in which the moving and significant agent is Jehovah, whose mouthpiece and representative the prophets were: "For the Lord God doeth nothing without revealing His counsel to His servants the prophets; the Lord God speaketh, who can but prophesy?" (Amos iii. 7 *seq.*); in other words, it is a history of revelation, for revelation implies that to certain individuals, and not immediately to the people at large, God makes Himself and His will known. According to this conception of prophecy, Moses was the first of that goodly fellowship; for though we think of him particularly as a lawgiver, and supposing he were what we call so, as he spake from God to men he belongs, whether he spake laws or great truths of the kingdom of God, or gave these truths expression and embodiment in institutions, to the class of prophets. And this is the conception which the O. T. writers entertain of him, and which he is represented as entertaining of himself: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy

[1] The question whether the *name* prophet (nabî') be early or later (1 Sam. ix. 9), is a different question.

brethren, like unto me" (Deut. xviii. 15); and it said in Hosea: "By a prophet the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt, and by prophets was he preserved" (xii. 13; Mic. vi. 4). The history and development of Israel was started by a prophet, and prophets conducted it along its whole course, and led it to its issue. The literary or canonical prophets whose writings are preserved to us are fully conscious of this. They are, as they think, but links in a chain. They did not create that ideal of Israel which they seek to see realized; they received it from the past. It is, no doubt, the opinion of some modern scholars that the great prophets of the eighth century, such as Amos and Hosea, are to a greater extent creative minds, and more distinctly the authors of the pure religious truths which they enunciate, than they give themselves credit for being. It is thought they were not able to distinguish between the sentiments which they saw to be necessary and true and the sentiments which satisfied a less advanced age and went for truth then. They imagined that the present must have been the *semper* and the *ubique;* and the condemnation passed by them upon their contemporaries who did not share their high conceptions of God and morals, though no doubt a just condemnation from the point of view of conceptions of religion and ethics true abstractly, was still a condemnation somewhat unjust in reference to their contemporaries, for these really held by the old opinions, and the chasm between them and the canonical prophets was not occasioned by their having retrograded, but by the canonical prophets having advanced. To us nowadays such a question has only secondary interest. The settlement of it requires a review and an estimate of the history of Israel from the beginning down to the eighth century; and, owing to the fact that the history as we possess it is mainly external, and to the other fact that it is not contemporary, but written somewhat later than the periods which

it covers, and may therefore be coloured with sentiments of a more advanced age, such an estimate is not easy to make in a way altogether satisfactory. The modern writers just referred to, however, appear to allow less weight to the historical sense of the prophets and their judgment regarding the past history of their nation than it is justly entitled to, and to push historical scepticism further than common sense will warrant.

We have some details of the external history of Moses, but little is told us of the history of his mind. It is the manner of the Old Testament to ascribe all that men do immediately to God, He being the real source of all true thoughts and great deeds; and those mental movements which we know to be always present when God enters into fellowship with men, it passes over. To detect them we have to read between the lines, to carry back something of our knowledge of how minds operate now when God is moving them, into the times of early history. God's revelation of Himself to Moses, and of His purpose of redeeming His people, was not made to a mind unprepared or out of sympathy. We are informed of the earlier efforts of Moses in the direction of delivering his people, and from the few facts mentioned we can imagine what aspirations filled his heart. Neither can we suppose that he was a mere mechanical instrument in conveying laws from Jehovah to Israel, or in embodying great principles of religion and civil order in practical institutions. The instruments employed by God are usually fit. The concurrence of the human mind with Him in all that He does by its means, is a thing which He requires, and which may in every case be assumed by us. It is this concurrence, or that mental range and elevation which enables a man to concur and co-operate with Jehovah, which is the secret of such a man's power over men, and fits him to be the servant of God in leading them. Moses was the servant of the Lord in the same sense in which Amos

and Hosea and Isaiah were His servants, and from reading their writings we know the mental tension, the high-strung feeling, the play of thought and emotion,—in a word, the devotion of heart and mind, with which they served Him. These were all great minds, but their place in history made their influence but secondary; at best, they could but give a happier direction or cut a deeper channel to the current already running. But Moses stood higher up; he had to unseal the fountain, to create the consciousness and life which those who came after him but deepened. And it is with this creative genius that we must credit him. He stamped an impress upon the people of Israel which was never effaced, and planted seeds in the mind of the nation which the crop of thorns that sprang up after his death could not altogether choke. Of course, even he did not create a nation or a religious consciousness in the sense of making it out of nothing. When he appealed to the people in Egypt in the name of Jehovah their God, he did not conjure with an abstraction or a novelty. The people had some knowledge of Jehovah, some faith in Him, or His name would not have awakened them to religious or national life. In matters like this we never can get at the beginning. The patriarchal age, with its knowledge of God, is not altogether a shadow, otherwise the history of the Exodus would be a riddle. Moses found materials, but he passed a new fire through them, and welded them into a unity; he breathed a spirit into the people, which animated it for all time to come; and this spirit can have been no other than the spirit that animated himself.

The controversies that rage around the name of Moses have little relevancy for the reader of prophecy. The prophets were religious and moral teachers; they directed their attention almost exclusively to the thoughts of God which men should cherish and to the conduct which they should practise, and to the influence which the first should

exert upon the other. The ritual was of interest to them only in so far as it might inspire right thoughts of Jehovah, or perhaps in so far as it might express these. In point of fact, in the days of the canonical prophets the ritual was associated with conceptions of Jehovah decidedly false, and the attitude of the prophets to it was less than friendly.

The term Theocracy was used by Josephus to express his idea of the government in Israel with which he was familiar, namely, the rule of God through a priestly hierarchy. If the theocracy in this sense was set before the people at the Exodus, it was only very slowly that it made any impression upon them, and it brought their life under the influence of its conception only at the return from exile. But in another sense the constitution of Israel was always a theocracy: Jehovah was their king and ruler because he was their God. The theocracy in this ideal sense, however, the kingdom of God of the prophets, did not require any particular external form, and did not cramp the life of the people into any particular mould. It was compatible with all forms: with the confederation of tribes under the Judges, with the monarchy whether independent or tributary, and with the condition of a mere community under the Persians. And the higher principles of the religion of Jehovah appear to have set to work just upon the conditions which they found, the forms of life existing; these, like leaven, they seized and sought to bring under their subjection. The principles which we see operating from the earliest times are the principles wielded by the prophets. They are few but comprehensive. They form the essence of the moral law—consisting of two principles and a fact, namely, that Jehovah was Israel's God [alone; and that his Being was ethical, demanding a moral life among those who served Him as His people; and these two principles elevated into a high emotional unity in the consciousness of redemption just experienced.

The primary element of the nation's consciousness was this sense of having been redeemed and delivered at the Exodus. This was the operation of Jehovah that "created" the people. If He who calls Himself "Jehovah" declares His identity with the God of Abraham and Isaac, it was under the name Jehovah that He performed His great act of salvation, and this act both gave the people existence and stamped indelibly on their consciousness that Jehovah was their God, and made them in thankfulness avow themselves His people. The conceptions "God" and "people" are correlative—Jehovah is Israel's God from the land of Egypt (Hos. xii. 9, xiii. 4). The two principles just referred to and the fact are entirely practical. To our minds such a statement as this, that Israel shall have no god but Jehovah, immediately suggests the inquiry, whether there be any other god but Him. But such questions might not present themselves to minds of a different cast from ours and in early times, for our minds are quickened by all the speculations about God which have filled the centuries from the days of Moses to our own. We may not have evidence that the mind of Israel in the earliest times put these general and abstract questions to itself. But we are certainly entirely precluded from inferring from the form of the first commandment that the existence of other gods was admitted, only that Israel should have none of them. For if we consider the moral element of the code, we find the commandments all taking the same negative form; but who will argue that when Moses said to Israel, Thou shalt not kill, he made murder unlawful merely in Israel, without feeling that it was unlawful wherever men existed?

The teaching of the prophets consists very much in ethicising the conception of Jehovah; the question which modern scholars discuss is, whether they may be observed themselves learning, or whether they are merely expanding into details and expressing, as history and events furnished

them with occasions, what was already known.[1] The answer we give to this question may modify our view of the history of revelation in Israel, but it can have no effect whatever on our own practical use of Scripture. The efforts of the prophets to reduce or to expand the conception of Jehovah into ethical forms, moved on two lines; the nature of Jehovah and His operations. Each of the great prophets has a particular conception of Jehovah, which he impresses on men. It is not improbable that this conception of each prophet may correspond to his own peculiar cast of mind, or reflect it. If this be so, it only means that God, in order to reveal the full round of His Being, chose for the purpose, one after another, a succession of men, in the mind of each of whom some one of His attributes was more clearly and strongly reflected than it was in the minds of ordinary men. In the mind of Amos it was His righteousness, in that of Hosea His love and mercy, in that of Isaiah His majesty and sovereignty. And thus, when step after step the full round of His being is presented, He appears as a transcendent moral Person. Love and mercy are included in the moral conception as much as justice, although the hope of redemption is always supported by remembrance of the salvation wrought at the beginning of the nation's history, from which new conclusions are drawn. But not only the nature of Jehovah, His operations also are gradually translated into moral forms. That which without irreverence may be called the theurgical, is resolved into moral processes, both on the side of God and on that of man. In the earlier prophets God forgives the nation's sin as a mere act of mercy, no doubt not without repentance on the people's part, produced by His judgments. But in a later prophet the Divine act is mediated—the Servant of

[1] A very good statement of the questions in dispute is furnished in König's *Hauptprobleme der altisrael. Religionsgeschichte.* Some of the arguments used are inconclusive, but the questions are clearly presented.

the Lord has borne the iniquity of them all. Similarly, in earlier writings He restores the people from their dispersion, and they are all righteous, though by what processes in their own minds they become so is not revealed. But later, the idea of a remnant appears, who have not fallen away, a holy seed, which becomes the root of a new community, widening out till a nation arise. At first the perfect kingdom of God is introduced by a single act of God, a great interposition and operation, men being spectators rather than agents. At a later period the kingdom is formed by God pouring out His Spirit on the people, on the king (Isa. xi.), and on all flesh (Joel ii.), and by writing His law on men's hearts (Jer. xxxi. 33). Possibly the O. T. does not go further. But even this operation of the Spirit needs resolution into moral forms on both sides, and this it receives in the N. T.: He receives of that which is Christ's and shows it; and, the love of Christ constraineth us.

The two principles, that Jehovah alone is God of Israel, and that His nature is moral, along with the memory of the redemption from Egypt, may be said to express the higher consciousness of the people—a consciousness that never died out. The two oldest written documents which Hebrew writers refer to, express this consciousness in their names. One of them is the Book of the Wars of Jehovah. It was the thought of Jehovah their God that made Israel strong in battle; He taught their hands to war; it was His battles which they fought, and the victories which they won were the righteous acts of Jehovah, the righteous acts of His rule in Israel (Jud. v. 11). The other was the Book of Jashar, the Upright. That which made Israel's heroes worthy of being commemorated was their righteousness. And the same two principles appear in all the utterances and acts of the Prophets. In the written prophecies this is evident in every page, but the scattered traditions of an earlier time reveal the same. The remonstrance of Nathan

with David in the matter of Uriah (2 Sam. xii.) does not need to be recalled, nor Gad's rebuke of his pride in numbering the people. It is evident that the policy of Solomon was disapproved by the prophets, for one of them, Ahijah of Shilo, foretold to Jeroboam his elevation to the sovereignty of the ten tribes, even when Solomon was alive (1 Kings xi. 29); and the same Ahijah denounced the wickedness of Jeroboam afterwards, and predicted the downfall of his dynasty (1 Kings xiv.). Similarly, Jehu the son of Hanani rebuked the wicked acts of Baasha (1 Kings xvi.) And it is difficult to know whether the indignation of Elijah was kindled most by the Baal worship of Ahab or by his nefarious murder of Naboth the Jezreelite. For it is not easy to say which of the two principles seemed the more important to the prophets. It is probable that they reacted on one another, and that each contributed to clarify and elevate the other. Modern writers endeavour to show that the theoretical or formal doctrine of the unity of God, expressed in later prophets, was reached through the conception of His ethical perfection; but it is doubtful if any priority on the side of either principle can be made out.

At any rate the history of Israel, as we read it in the pages of the prophets and in the O. T. in general, is the history of a conflict in which these two great principles, forming the higher consciousness of the people, are seen making strenuous efforts to gain possession of the whole life of the nation and to rule it, efforts which the lower tendencies of the people's minds, their sensuousness both in life and thinking, ministered to by the seductions of nature and the baser religious rites of their neighbours around them, seemed continually to resist. Practically the victory may appear to have been won by the lower, for the people as a whole would not convert and be healed, and they had to be cast out; but in truth the victory remained with the higher,

for the teaching of the prophets was accepted by the people when they saw it verified in their disastrous history, and from them it passed to mankind, and is our inheritance to-day.

The first period of the nation's history is the period of the Judges. Unfortunately our information regarding this period is scanty, the only testimony from the higher spirit, as we may call it, being the Song of Deborah. But the scattered notices which we can glean give us a glimpse into processes going on during this time which greatly help to explain the conflict which the prophets had to wage in after ages. The Book of Judges which covers this period is composed of two elements easily separable. The main substance of the Book consists of brief histories of six persons called Judges, with references to six others of whom few historical reminiscences are preserved. There is no reason to suppose that the number twelve is artificial, corresponding to the number of tribes, for there are several tribes from which no judges arose. Besides this main substance of the Book, there is a frame in which the histories are set, appearing most obviously in ch. ii. 6–iii. 6, but also in the introductions to most of the individual histories. This frame is probably younger than the histories, and its point of view may be that of a later time. It connects the histories together by giving a summary of them under the form of an ideal *schema* in which the same steps are regularly repeated: "The children of Israel did that which was evil and served the Baalim. And they provoked the Lord to anger, and He sold them into the hand of their enemies. And when the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, He raised up a saviour who saved them; and the land had rest so many years." This regular movement of apostasy, subjugation, penitence, and deliverance is hardly strict history. It is rather the religious philosophy of the history. It is a summary of the historical move-

ments written under the idea that Jehovah presided in the history of Israel, and to bring it down to our level we must read second causes into the movements and the operations of the people's mind. We shall not misunderstand it if we put ourselves into the author's point of view, and remember that he speaks of Israel as an ideal unity, and attributes to this unity defections which no doubt characterized only fragments of the whole; and finally that he uses the nomenclature of his day, calling by the name of Baalim and the like all objects of worship and practices in his view improper in the service of God.[1] Without these considerations the history would not be intelligible; for a falling away of a whole people to Baal, and then a conversion to Jehovah, to be followed by a falling away again twenty years after, is not according to the operations of the human mind. The author's general conception, however, that

[1] Hosea already calls the calf-images of Jehovah, Baalim, and later the word received even a wider and more general application. Wellhausen makes merry over the fact that the author says that Israel worshipped the Asheras, "which are no divinities at all, but only sacred trees or poles" (*Hist.*, p. 235). We are slow to believe that an O. T. writer did not know what an Ashera was. In his less jocular moods W. treats the question differently, whether correctly or not (*Bleek*, p. 245). W. is equally unjust to the writer when he blames him for speaking of Israel as a unity, for the same conception appears in Deborah (see below). Again W. charges the writer with ignorance when he says that the children of Israel made Baal Berith their god (viii. 33), whereas the next chapter informs us that Baal Berith "was only the patron god of Shechem and some other cities belonging to the Canaanites." Much fairer is the suggestion of Reuss: "Baal Berith (Covenant Baal) indicates an affiliation of several tribes or septs, *possibly such an affiliation of Israelites and Canaanites*" (*Gesch. d. Alt. Test.*, p. 122). The pet passage, chap. xi. 24, figures of course in W., as it does everywhere since Vatke (p. 258). In the original histories of the Judges, "Israel is a people just like other people, nor is even his relation to Jehovah otherwise conceived of than is, for example, that of Moab to Chemosh" (*Hist.*, p. 235). Elsewhere, however, W. regards the whole passage Jud. xi. 12–29, with the allusion to Chemosh, as a later intepolation founded on Num. xx. 21 (*Bleek*, p. 195). The supposed pretensions of Chemosh in the eyes of Israel are likely to suffer from this judgment, for the passage cannot be earlier than well down in the age of the canonical prophets. The truth is that such references to Chemosh and other heathen gods prove nothing, because they would prove that even Jeremiah regarded Chemosh as a real divinity (Jer. xlviii. 7).

defection from Jehovah was followed by subjection to the neighbouring nations, has profound truth. For that which created Israel's self-consciousness was its deliverance from Egypt by Jehovah. That which made it a people was its God; its feeling of Him made it feel itself a people. The antithesis between it and the nations lay in Him. When therefore it fell into the worship of the nations around it or of the tribes within it which it had absorbed, its self-consciousness as a people was, so to speak, obscured. That which made it a nation, and was the bond of its unity and spring of its strength, was broken, its high idea as a people departed, and it fell into fragments, and became the prey of the peoples among whom it dwelt. Only when its miseries turned its thoughts back to Him who was its strength, and when its faith in Him awakened again its consciousness of itself—in the words of the writer, when it cried unto the Lord—did its power return, and it was able, in the feeling of Jehovah's presence with it, to resist and vanquish its oppressors.

The histories preserved in the Book of Judges are for the most part external; they are probably traditions preserved among the individual tribes who played the chief part in the events described. That in some instances we have duplicates, exhibiting divergences in details, is natural, and does not detract from the general historical worth of the whole. The Story of Deborah is given in a prose form (ch. iv.) as well as in the poem, and the divergences can be accounted for only on the supposition that chap. iv. is an independent tradition. The picture presented by the Book as a whole is rough, but there are traits of tenderness here and there in it. The histories exhibit the occurrences, and show how men dealt with the hard facts of life; the poem breathes the higher spirit that animated them.

First, in regard to the political situation. We observe that the high spirit created in the tribes by their redemp-

tion from Egypt, which fused them for the time into a unity and enabled them to overcome the strongest combinations against them, has departed. We are introduced to the generation that succeeded the generation led by Joshua (Jud. ii. 7), and the old unity appears almost completely dissolved. No general expulsion of the native races was attempted. The ideal division of the land by lot under Joshua remained ideal.

In ch. i., a very valuable historical record, we read: "The children of Benjamin did not drive out the Jebusites that dwelt in Jerusalem; but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin unto this day. Manasseh did not drive out the inhabitants of Beth-shean and her towns: . . . but the Canaanites would dwell in that land. Ephraim drave not out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer; but the Canaanites dwelt among them. Zebulun, . . . the Canaanites dwelt among them. Asher, . . . the Asherites dwelt among the Canaanites. Naphtali, . . . he dwelt among the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land." And so the story runs. The Israel of the Judges and henceforth was not the Israel that came out of Egypt, it was a new and larger nation, having absorbed into it a vast native population, with a civilization which it largely adopted, with modes of thought with which it could not but become inoculated, and with religious practices which in many cases it accepted. The Israel of Moses and the Israel with which history and the prophets deal are different both in quantity, and even more in quality.

Consequently we observe a disintegration going on in the unity of the people. The tribes appear little interested in each other; each of them is settling down in earnest to secure his own footing and to provide for his own preservation. The judges that arise belong to the individual tribes, and rarely secure the adhesion of more than two or three

others in the warfare. Ehud the Benjamite avenges Benjamin, Jephthah of Gilead leads the transjordanic tribes, and Gideon pursues the Midianites with an army of his own family of Abiezer.

Nevertheless, though there is no union of the tribes in fact, the nearest approach to it being the coalition secured by Deborah, there is an ideal unity. Even when a single tribe acts, or when a judge delivers a single district, it is "Israel" that is saved. And it is not in the prose only that this conception prevails, in which a view arising after the existence of the kingdom might be reflected—the Song of Deborah is pervaded by the same idea: "For that the chiefs came forward in Israel, for that the people offered themselves willingly, praise ye Jehovah" (*v.* 2); "my heart is toward the governors of Israel that offered themselves willingly among the people" (*v.* 9); "Was there a shield or spear seen among forty thousand in Israel?" (*v.* 8); "the rulers ceased in Israel, they ceased, until that I Deborah arose, a mother in Israel" (*v.* 7). In spite of actual disintegration, the conception of a people Israel, forming a unity, the people of Jehovah (*v.* 11), everywhere appears. In one remarkable point indeed, extremely significant in regard to subsequent history, the unity is incomplete. The tribe of Judah does not appear to be comprehended in the "Israel" of Deborah; she does not expect Judah to join the confederacy of the North, the term Israel already is appropriated by the northern half of the nation. The date of the Song is not certain, though it must be early—before the tribe of Dan migrated to the north (ch. xvii.–xviii.), for Dan is still a seaboard tribe (*v.* 17). The two powerful tribes of Judah and Ephraim had already begun each to pursue its own course, and the smaller tribes were attracted around the latter, which early aspired to the leadership.

In regard to religion, apart from the later framework not much prominence is given to it. The central sanctuary was

no doubt at Shilo, though the place is mentioned only once, in connexion with dances, which took place probably at the feasts. It is to be supposed that the same practical disintegration manifested itself in the sphere of religion as appeared in the political sphere. The individual tribes probably provided each for itself its religious institutions. They adopted the places of worship existing among the Canaanites. Both Deuteronomy and Ezekiel suggest that the "high places" were original Canaanitish shrines. The syncretism could not stop with the adoption of the places of worship, many also of the religious rites would be assumed into the service of Jehovah. Here and there, where the two peoples coalesced by intermarriage (Jud. iii. 6), particularly where the aborigines outnumbered the Israelites, as at Shechem, the worship of Baal and the Astartes might supersede the worship of Jehovah. It was not, however, so much in this direction that the danger lay, but rather in the direction of debasing the ostensible service of Jehovah by assimilating it to the Canaanitish worship, and thus effacing in the people's minds the distinction between their God and the Baals of the native population. It is probable that the practice of making images of Jehovah was borrowed or imitated from the Canaanites, for no images were ever set in the central temple, whether at Shilo or elsewhere.

Yet in spite of this practical declension in religion, the ideal unity was still preserved. Jehovah was the God of Israel; it was to Him that the people belonged. It was to Him that Jephthah made his fatal vow—before the Lord in Mizpeh (Jud. xi. 11, 30). It was to Jehovah that Gideon dedicated the spoils of Midian, out of which he framed an image, or at least an "oracle" of Jehovah, which he set up in his house. It was to Jehovah that Micah made his "house of God," and the image which the Danites ultimately placed in Dan—another forestalment in this early

age of subsequent proceedings. But it is in Deborah that the ideal unity of the worship and the higher conceptions of Jehovah appear most clearly. If we possessed a few more utterances of the prophetic mind in this age, in place of the external histories of rude soldiers, we should probably be led to form a higher conception even of the religious condition of the people under the Judges. She says: "I will sing, I will sing unto Jehovah, I will sing praise unto Jehovah, the God of Israel" (*v.* 3). It is Jehovah who fights Israel's battles: "They shall rehearse the righteous acts of Jehovah, the righteous acts of His rule in Israel. Then the people of Jehovah went down to the gates" (*v.* 11). His angel, that is, probably Himself in personal presence, leads Israel's armies and pursues His foes: "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of Jehovah, because they came not to the help of Jehovah among the mighty" (*v.* 23). The enemies of Israel are the enemies of Jehovah: "So let all Thine enemies perish, Jehovah: but let them that *love* Him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might" (*v.* 31)—a singular and lofty expression in so early an age. When we recall the vow of Jephthah and the acts of Gideon, we might suppose that the conceptions entertained of Jehovah were not very elevated; yet in the Song He appears to rule in heaven and on earth, commanding the stars in their courses and the rivers in their flood: "The stars fought from heaven, they fought in their courses against Sisera. The river Kishon swept them away, that rushing river, the river Kishon" (*v.* 20).

The lack of materials of the class to which the Song belongs prevents us from getting a clearer view of the higher side of the national mind at this epoch, and the histories reveal great rudeness of manners, and in many instances debased religious conceptions. The period, however, is the creative epoch of historical Israel; the workshop in which the nation, as we know it, was fashioned. We

observe the origin of that complication which the canonical prophets seek to unravel; the knot is being tied which they use all their efforts to unloose. There is going on a mixture of elements which produces the fermentation familiar to us in later times. The higher spirit and faith of the nation has presented for its assimilation a mass of conceptions and elements which it is unable at once to overcome and dominate. Yet it does not allow itself to lose courage. It is assured of eventual victory.

A. B. Davidson.

NOTES ON DIFFICULT TEXTS.

1 Sam. i. 5. וּלְחַנָּה יִתֵּן מָנָה אַחַת אַפַּיִם, "and to Hannah he used to give one portion אַפַּיִם." What is the meaning of this Hebrew word? It is rendered (1) "heavily." So, for instance, the Vulgate (*tristis*), several mediæval authorities (e.g. the Great Bible: "a portion with an heavy cheer"), and amongst moderns, Böttcher and Thenius. For this sense of אַפַּיִם, however, there is no support in the known usage of the language: בְּאַפַּיִם occurs with the meaning "in anger" in Dan. xi. 20; but that would be unsuitable here, and the expressions נפלו פניך (Gen. iv. 6) and פניה לא היו לה עוד (1 Sam. i. 18) are not sufficient to justify the sense of a *dejected* countenance being assigned to אפים.

It is rendered (2), in connexion with מָנָה אַחַת, *one portion of two faces* (=two persons), i.e. a double portion. So Keil and even Gesenius. It is true that the Syriac ܦܢܝ corresponds generally in usage with the Hebrew פָּנִים; but, to say nothing of the fact that a Syriasm is unexpected in Samuel, there is nothing in the use of the Syriac word to suggest that the *dual* would, in Hebrew, denote *two* persons: ܦܢܝ (like פָּנִים) is used of *one* person, the singular not occurring. If אַפַּיִם means *two* persons, it must be implied that the singular אַף might denote *one* person, which the

meaning of the word obviously does not permit. Secondly, the construction, if this rendering were correct, would be unexampled. אפים evidently cannot be in the *genitive* after מנה אחת; and the disparity between the two ideas (*one portion* and *two persons*) precludes us from treating it as an instance of apposition (as is suggested by Keil): Ewald, § 287*b*, offers in this respect nothing parallel. Grammatically, therefore, not less than lexically, this rendering is exposed to the gravest objections.

(3) The rendering of A.V., *a worthy portion*, is inherited from the Geneva Version of 1560, and is based ultimately upon the Targum, which has חולק חד בחיר, i.e. "one *choice* portion." בְּחִיר, *choice*, corresponds in the Targum to the Hebrew אפים; but it is clear that it is no translation of it, nor can it be derived from it by any intelligible process.[1] Evidently it is a mere conjecture, designed to replace the untranslatable word by something that will more or less harmonize with the context.

The Hebrew text does not admit of a defensible rendering. In the LXX. אפים is represented by πλήν, i.e. אֶפֶס. This reading at once relieves the difficulty of the verse, and affords a consistent and grammatical sense. אֶפֶס כִּי restricts or qualifies the preceding clause, precisely as in Num. xiii. 28. "But unto Hannah he used to give one portion": this, following the "portions" of *v.* 4, might seem to imply that Elkanah felt less affection for her than for Peninnah. To obviate such a misconception, the writer adds: "*Howbeit* he loved Hannah; but the Lord had shut up her womb," the last clause assigning the reason why Hannah received but one portion.[2] Hence the margin in the R.V., which, strange to say, is denounced by a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* (Oct., 1885, p. 468) as "absolutely silly" (!).[3]

[1] Kimchi, in his *Commentary* and the *Book of Roots*, makes two attempts to account for it—both equally unsuccessful.

[2] So rightly Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, p. 36.

[3] The above note (in substance) was contributed originally by the writer to

i. 20. What is the connexion between the name Samuel and the ground alleged for its choice? Of course, the derivation suggested by the margin of A.V., "that is, *Asked of God*," as if שְׁמוּאֵל were contracted from שְׁאוּל מֵאֵל, cannot be maintained: such a contraction would be altogether alien to the genius of the language. What the writer means to express must be (as often in the O.T.) an assonance, not an etymology: the name שמואל *recalled* to his mind the word שאול, *asked*, though in no sense derived from it, just as Cain or Moses, for instance, recalled or suggested the verbs *qānāh*, to get, and *māshāh*, to draw out, though the names do not themselves *signify* either "gotten" or "drawn out." What, however, is the actual meaning of the name Samuel? When the explanation "asked of God" was seen to be untenable, an attempt was made to bring the name into some sort of connexion with the text by the suggestion that it was = שְׁמוּעֵאֵל, and signified "heard of God." Had this, however, been the writer's intention, we should have expected the word *hear* to occur somewhere in the narrative, which is not the case. But there are even more serious objections to this derivation. (1) Had this been the true account of the name, the א rather than the ע would have been naturally the letter elided: an original שְׁמוּעֵאֵל would have given rise to שְׁמוּעֵאל (on the analogy of יִשְׁמָעֵאל) rather than to שְׁמוּאֵל.[1] (2) Compound proper names in Hebrew are constructed, for the most part, after particular types or models: thus one large class consists of one of the sacred names followed by a verb in the perfect tense (the last vowel only being lengthened, after the analogy of substantives), as *Elnāthān*, *Yonāthān*, *Elyādā'*, *Yehoyādā'*, i.e. *El* (or *Yah*) *has given*, *El* (or *Yah*) *has known*. Another

Hebraica, for October, 1885, a quarterly journal edited by W. R. Harper, now Professor of Semitic Languages at Yale College, formerly Principal of the American Institute of Hebrew at Chicago, and testifying to the interest with which Hebrew and cognate studies are prosecuted in the New World.

[1] In יְדִיעֵאֵל, 1 Chron. vii. 6 *al.*, even the א is not elided.

class is similarly compounded, but the verb stands first, as *Hananyah, Hanan'el, Yah* (or *El*) *has been gracious, ʿAzaryah, ʿAzar'el, Yah* (or *El*) *has helped.* In a third class the verb still stands first, but is in the imperfect tense, as *Yerachme'el, El hath mercy, Ya'azanyah, Yah hearkeneth.* There are, of course, other types, which need not however be here considered. But numerous as are the proper names compounded of one of the sacred names and a verb, *there are none, or next to none, compounded with a passive participle.* Obvious as such a form as *blessed* or *helped* or *redeemed of Yah* might appear to be, it was uniformly discarded by the Hebrews. We have *Baruch* and *Zabud*, for instance, but Berachyah or Yeberechyah, not בְּרוּכְיָה, Yozabad, Elzabad, or Zebadyah, not זְבוּדְיָה; we have not only Elnathan and Yehonathan (or Yonathan), but also Nethanyah and Nethan'el, not however Nethūn'el; we have Shemaʿyah and Ishmaʿel[1] (also Elishāmāʿ), but not שמועאל. There is *no* name in the O.T. formed analogously to a presumable שמועאל, *heard of God;*[2] and the fact that this type of compound name was studiously avoided by the Hebrews is a strong additional argument against the proposed derivation of "Samuel."

The derivation suggested by Gesenius, שְׁמוּאֵל = "Name of God," is as obvious as it is natural. It is suitable and appropriate in itself; and the form of compound which it implies is in exact agreement with *Penu'el*, "Face of God," *Reʿu'el*, "Friend of God," as well as (probably) *Ge'u'el*,

[1] i.e. *Yah has heard*, and *God heareth.*

[2] The only possible exception would be *Meḥuya'el*, Gen. iv. 18, if this mean "smitten of God," which, however, is far from certain: following the Qri, we may vocalize מְחָיָאֵל, which would agree with the LXX. Μαιήλ, i.e. "God is a life-giver (Budde, *Biblische Urgeschichte*, p. 128). But, in any case, an archaic name such as this has no appreciable bearing upon the usage of the language in historic times. With *active* participles, there occur the compounds Meshelemyah, 1 Chron. ix. 21, xxvi. 1, 2, 9; and the *Aramaic* Meshezab'el, "God is a deliverer," Neh. iii. 4 *al.*; and Mehetab'el, "God is a benefactor," Neh. vi. 10 (in Gen. xxxvi. 39 the name borne by the wife of an Edomite king).

"Majesty of God," and *Hammu'el*, "Warmth (?) of God." The *u*, it is hardly necessary to remark, is the old case-termination, retained as a binding vowel, both in the instances cited, and also occasionally besides: e.g. in Methu-shelach, "Man of the weapon," and Methu-shael,[1] "Man who belongs to God." It is remarkable that Keil, when the circumstances are so clear, should still adhere to the interpretation *a Deo exauditus*.

Josh. vi. 18. "But ye, in any wise keep yourselves from the devoted thing," פֶּן תחרימו ולקחתם מן החרם, Knobel: "lest ye devote, and take of the devoted thing, and make the camp of Israel to be devoted, and trouble it"; which in R.V. is transformed into the more intelligible sentence, "Lest, *when ye have devoted it*, *ye* take of the devoted thing," etc. But yet what a weak and tautologous sense is thus obtained! The original reading is clearly preserved here in the LXX. *μή ποτε ἐνθυμηθέντες*, κ.τ.λ., i.e. פֶּן תַּחְמְדוּ וְלָקַחְתֶּם וגו' "lest ye *covet* and take of the devoted thing, and make," etc. All that is needed is a transposition of two letters תחמדו for תחרמו (written as it once would be written, without the ו); and the correctness of the conjecture is strongly confirmed by vii. 21, where Achan says: "And I saw among the spoil a goodly Babylonish mantle, etc., and *I coveted them* (ואחמדם[2]), and I took them."[3]

Josh. xix. 47. ויצא גבול בני דן מהם *lit.* "And the border of the children of Dan *went out from them*," which gives no intelligible sense. יצא, *to go out*, is indeed used with גבול, *border*, but only to express the idea of its *continuous extension* in a given direction (as ch. xv. 3, 4, 9, etc.), not, as here, of its receiving an accession in an altogether different

[1] According to Lenormant, *Les origines de l'histoire* (1880, p. 263), a formation definitely Assyrian.

[2] LXX. (as in vi. 18) *καὶ ἐνθυμηθεὶς αὐτῶν ἔλαβον.*

[3] So Hollenberg in his useful monograph, *Der Charakter der Alexandrinischen Uebersetzung des Buches Josua* (Moers, 1876), p. 12.

part of the country, especially when the words immediately following, instead of proceeding to define the new border more precisely, describe the action of the Danites: "And the children of Dan went up and fought with Leshem, and took it," etc. For וַיֵּצֵא read וַיֵּצַר, and the verse becomes at once consistent and clear: "And the border of the children of Dan *was too narrow* for them; and the children of Dan went up and fought with Leshem, and took it," etc. A close parallel, both for the use of צר and for the construction, is afforded by 2 Kings vi. 1, "The place in which we dwell before thee צַר מִמֶּנּוּ *is too narrow for us*." The LXX., though their text is in some confusion and the rendering loose, appear to have had this reading before them: *καὶ ἔθλιψαν ἀπ' αὐτῶν τὸ ὅριον τῆς μερίδος αὐτῶν*. צר and its derivatives are represented by *θλίβω* in LXX., Jud. x. 9; 1 Sam. xxx. 6, and elsewhere.

S. R. Driver.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

TYCHICUS AND ONESIMUS, THE LETTER-BEARERS.

XXIV.

"All my affairs shall Tychicus make known unto you, the beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord: whom I have sent unto you for this very purpose, that ye may know our estate, and that he may comfort your hearts; together with Onesimus, the faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you. They shall make known unto you all things that *are done* here."—Col. iv. 7–9 (Rev. Ver.).

In Paul's days it was perhaps more difficult to get letters delivered than to write them. It was a long, weary journey from Rome to Colossæ,—across Italy, then by sea to Greece, across Greece, then by sea to the port of Ephesus, and thence by rough ways to the upland valley where lay Colossæ, with its neighbouring towns of Laodicea and

Hierapolis. So one thing which the Apostle has to think about is to find some one to carry his letter. He pitches upon these two, Tychicus and Onesimus. The former is one of his personal attendants, told off for this duty; the other, who has been in Rome under very peculiar circumstances, is going home to Colossæ, on a strange errand, in which he may be helped by having a message from Paul to carry.

This paper will not deal with the words before us, so much as with these two figures, whom I shall regard as representing certain principles, and embodying some useful lessons.

I. We may regard Tychicus as representing *the greatness and sacredness of small and secular service done for Christ.*

We must first try, in as few words as may be, to change the name into a man. There is something very solemn and pathetic in these shadowy names which appear for a moment on the page of Scripture, and are swallowed up of black night, like stars that suddenly blaze out for a week or two, and then dwindle and at last disappear altogether. They too lived, and loved, and strove, and suffered, and enjoyed: and now—all is gone, gone; the hot fire burned down to such a little handful of white ashes. Tychicus and Onesimus! two shadows that once were men! and as they are, so we shall be.

As to Tychicus, there are several fragmentary notices about him in the Acts of the Apostles and in Paul's letters, and although they do not amount to much, still by piecing them together, and looking at them with some sympathy, we can get a notion of the man.

He does not appear till near the end of Paul's missionary work, and was probably one of the fruits of the Apostle's long residence in Ephesus on his last missionary tour, as we do not hear of Tychicus till after that period. That stay in Ephesus was cut short by the silversmiths' riot—

the earliest example of trades' unions—when they wanted to silence the preaching of the gospel because it damaged the market for "shrines," and "*also*" was an insult to the great goddess! Thereupon Paul retired to Europe, and after some months there, decided on his last fateful journey to Jerusalem. On the way he was joined by a remarkable group of friends, seven in number, and apparently carefully selected so as to represent the principal fields of the Apostle's labours. There were three Europeans, two from "Asia"—meaning by that name, of course, only the Roman province, which included mainly the western seaboard—and two from the wilder inland country of Lycaonia. Tychicus was one of the two from Asia; the other was Trophimus, whom we know to have been an Ephesian (Acts xxi. 29), as Tychicus may not improbably have also been.

We do not know that all the seven accompanied Paul to Jerusalem. Trophimus we know did, and another of them, Aristarchus, is mentioned as having sailed with him on the return voyage from Palestine (Acts xxvii. 2). But if they were not intended to go to Jerusalem, what did they meet him for at all? The sacredness of the number seven, the apparent care to secure a representation of the whole field of apostolic activity, and the long distances that some of them must have travelled, make it extremely unlikely that these men should have met him at a little port in Asia Minor for the mere sake of being with him for a few days. It certainly seems much more probable that they joined his company and went on to Jerusalem. What for? Probably as bearers of money contributions from the whole area of the Gentile Churches, to the "poor saints" there—a purpose which would explain the composition of the delegation. Paul was too sensitive and too sagacious to have more to do with money matters than he could help. We learn from his letter to the Church at Corinth that he insisted

on another brother being associated with him in the administration of their alms, so that no man could raise suspicions against him. Paul's principle was that which ought to guide every man entrusted with other people's money to spend for religious or charitable purposes.—"I shall not be your almoner unless some one appointed by you stands by me to see that I spend your money rightly" —a good example which, it is much to be desired, were followed by all workers, and required to be followed as a condition of all giving.

These seven, at all events, began the long journey with Paul. Among them is our friend Tychicus, who may have learned to know the Apostle more intimately during it, and perhaps developed qualities in travel which marked him out as fit for the errand on which we here find him.

This voyage was about the year 58 A.D. Then comes an interval of some three or four years, in which occur Paul's arrest and imprisonment at Cæsarea, his appearance before governors and kings, his voyage to Italy and shipwreck, with his residence in Rome. Whether Tychicus was with him, as well as Luke, we do not know, nor at what point he joined the Apostle, if he was not his companion throughout. But this passage shows us that he was with Paul during part of his first Roman captivity, probably about A.D. 62 or 63; and the language of commendation in these verses, "a faithful minister," or helper of Paul, implies that for a considerable period before this he had been rendering services to the Apostle.

He is now despatched all the long way to Colossæ to carry this letter, and to tell the Church by word of mouth all that had happened in Rome. No information of that kind is in the letter itself, which, in that respect, forms a remarkable contrast to the affectionate abundance of personal details in another prison letter, that to the Philippians, and is thereby probably marked out as addressed to

a Church never visited by Paul. He is sent, according to the most probable reading, that "ye may know our estate, and that he may comfort your hearts"—encouraging the brethren to Christian stedfastness, not only by his news of Paul, but by his own company and exhortations.

The very same words are employed about Tychicus in the contemporaneous letter to the Ephesians. Evidently then he carried both epistles on the same journey; and one reason for selecting him as messenger is plainly that he was a native of the province, and probably of Ephesus. When Paul looked round his little circle of attendant friends, his eye fell on Tychicus, as the very man for such an errand. "You go, Tychicus. It is your home; they all know you."

The most careful students now think that the Epistle to the Ephesians was meant to go the round of the Churches of Asia Minor, beginning, no doubt, with that in the great city of Ephesus. If that be so, and Tychicus had to carry it to these Churches in turn, he would necessarily come, in the course of his duty, to Laodicea, which was only a few miles from Colossæ, and so could most conveniently deliver this Epistle. The wider and the narrower mission fitted into each other.

No doubt he went, and did his work. We can fancy the eager groups, perhaps in some upper room, perhaps in some quiet place of prayer by the river side; in their midst the two messengers, and a little knot of listeners and questioners round each. How they would have to tell the story a dozen times over! how every detail would be precious! how tears would come and hearts would glow! how deep into the night they would talk! and how many a heart that had begun to waver would be confirmed in cleaving to Christ by the exhortations of Tychicus, by the very sight of Onesimus, and by Paul's words of fire!

What became of him after that journey we do not know. Perhaps he settled down at Ephesus for a time, perhaps he

returned to Paul. At any rate, we get two more glimpses of him at a later period—one in the Epistle to Titus, in which we hear of Paul's intention to despatch him on another journey to Crete, and the last in the close of the second Epistle to Timothy, written from Rome probably about A.D. 67. The Apostle believes that his death is near, and seems to have sent away most of his staff. Among the notices of their various appointments we read, "Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus." He is not said to have been sent on any mission connected with the Churches. It may be that he was simply sent away because, by reason of his impending martyrdom, Paul had no more need of him. True, he still has Luke by him, and he wishes Timothy to come and bring his first "minister," Mark, with him. But he has sent away Tychicus, as if he had said, Now, go back to your home, my friend! You have been a faithful servant for ten years. I need you no more. Go to your own people, and take my blessing. God be with you! So they parted, he that was for death, to die; and he that was for life, to live and to treasure the memory of Paul in his heart for the rest of his days. These are the facts; ten years of faithful service to the Apostle, partly during his detention in Rome, and much of it spent in wearisome and dangerous travelling—all to carry a couple of letters.

As for his character, Paul has given us something of it in these few words, which have commended him to a wider circle than the handful of Christians at Colossæ. As for his personal godliness and goodness, he is "a beloved brother," as are all who love Christ; but he is also a "faithful minister," or personal attendant upon the Apostle. Paul always seems to have had one or two such about him, from the time of his first journey, when John Mark filled the post, to the end of his career. Probably he was no great hand at managing affairs, and needed some plain common-sense nature beside him, who would be secretary or amanu-

ensis sometimes, and general helper and factotum. Men of genius and men devoted to some great cause which tyrannously absorbs attention, want some person to fill such a homely office. The person who filled it would be likely to be a plain man, not gifted for higher service in any special degree. Common sense, willingness to be troubled with small details of purely secular arrangements, and a hearty love for the chief, and desire to spare him annoyance and work were the qualifications. Such probably was Tychicus—no orator, no organiser, no thinker, but simply an honest, loving soul who did not shrink from rough outward work, if only it might help the cause. We do not read that he was teacher or preacher, or miracle worker. His gift was—ministry, and he gave himself to his ministry. His business was to run Paul's errands, and, like a true man, he ran them "faithfully."

So then, he is fairly taken as representing the greatness and sacredness of small and secular service for Christ. For the Apostle goes on to add something to his eulogium as a "faithful minister"—when he calls him "a fellow-servant," or slave, "in the Lord." As if he had said, Do not suppose that because I write this letter, and Tychicus carries it, there is much difference between us. We are both slaves of the same Lord who has set each of us his tasks; and though the tasks be different, the obedience is the same, and the doers stand on one level. I am not Tychicus' master, though he be my minister. We have both, as I have been reminding you that you all have, an owner in heaven. The delicacy of the turn thus given to the commendation is a beautiful indication of Paul's generous, chivalrous nature. No wonder that such a soul bound men like Tychicus to him!

But there is more than merely a revelation of a beautiful character in the words; there are great truths in them. We may draw them out in two or three thoughts.

Small things done for Christ are great. Trifles that contribute and are indispensable to a great result are great; or perhaps, more properly, both words are out of place. In some powerful engine there is a little screw, and if it drop out, the great piston cannot rise nor the huge crank turn. What have big and little to do with things which are equally indispensable? There is a great rudder that steers an ironclad. It moves on a "pintle" a few inches long. If that bit of iron were gone, what would become of the rudder, and what would be the use of the ship with all her guns? There is an old jingling rhyme about losing a shoe for want of a nail, and a horse for want of a shoe, and a man for want of a horse, and a battle for want of a man, and a kingdom for loss of a battle. The intervening links may be left out—and the nail and the kingdom brought together. In a similar spirit, we may say that the trifles done for Christ which help the great things are as important as these. What is the use of writing letters, if you cannot get them delivered? It takes both Paul and Tychicus to get the letter into the hands of the people at Colossæ.

Another thought suggested by the figure of Paul's minister, who was also his fellow-slave, is *the sacredness of secular work done for Christ.* When Tychicus is caring for Paul's comfort, and looking after common things for him, he is serving Christ, and his work is "in the Lord." That is equivalent to saying that the distinction between sacred and secular, religious and non-religious, like that of great and small, disappears from work done for and in Jesus. Whenever there is organization, there must be much work concerned with purely material things: and the most spiritual forces must have some organization. There must be men for "the outward business of the house of God" as well as the white-robed priests at the altar, and the rapt gazer in the secret place of the Most High. There are a

hundred matters of detail and of purely outward and mechanical nature which must be seen to by somebody. The alternative is to do them in a purely mechanical and secular manner and so to make the work utterly dreary and contemptible, or in a devout and earnest manner and so to hallow them all, and make worship of them all. The difference between two lives is not in the material on which, but in the motive from which, and in the end for which they are respectively lived. All work done in obedience to the same Lord is the same in essence; for it is all obedience; and all work done for the same God is the same in essence, for it is all worship. The distinction between secular and sacred ought never to have found its way into Christian morals, and ought for evermore to be expelled from Christian life.

Another thought may be suggested. *The fleeting things done for Christ are eternal.* How astonished Tychicus would have been if anybody had told him on that day when he got away from Rome, with the two precious letters in his scrip, that these bits of parchment would outlast all the ostentatious pomp of the city, and that his name, because written in them, would be known to the end of time all over the world! The eternal things are the things done for Christ. They are eternal in His memory who has said, "I will never forget any of their works," however they may fall from man's remembrance. They are perpetual in their consequences. True, no man's contribution to the mighty sum of things "that make for righteousness" can very long be traced as separate from the others, any more than the raindrop that refreshed the harebell on the moor can be traced in burn, and river, and sea. But for all that, it is there. So our influence for good blends with a thousand others, and may not be traceable beyond a short distance, still it is there: and no true work for Christ, abortive as it may seem, but goes to swell the great aggre-

gate of forces which are working on through the ages to bring the perfect Order.

That Colossian Church seems a failure. Where is it now? Gone. Where are its sister Churches of Asia? Gone. Paul's work and Tychicus' seem to have vanished from the earth, and Mohammedanism to have taken its place. Yes! and here are we to-day in England, and Christian men all over the world in lands that were mere slaughterhouses of savagery then, learning our best lessons from Paul's words, and owing something for our knowledge of them to Tychicus' humble care. Paul meant to teach a handful of obscure believers—he has edified the world. Tychicus thought to carry the precious letter safely over the sea—he was helping to send it across the centuries, and to put it into our hands. So little do we know where our work will terminate. Our only concern is where it begins. Let us look after this end, the motive; and leave God to take care of the other, the consequences.

Such work will be perpetual in its consequences on ourselves. "Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious." Whether our service for Christ does others any good or no, it will bless ourselves, by strengthening the motives from which it springs, by enlarging our own knowledge and enriching our own characters, and by a hundred other gracious influences which his work exerts upon the devout worker, and which become indissoluble parts of himself, and abide with him for ever, over and above the crown of glory that fadeth not away.

And, as the reward is given not to the outward deed, but to the motive which settles its value, all work done from the same motive is alike in reward, howsoever different in form. It was a law in Israel, that the division of the spoils of victory gave an equal share to him "that goeth down to the battle," and to him "that tarrieth by the stuff"—for all had contributed to the victory, and the fighters in the

front had no braver hearts than the rearguard that looked after the base of operations, and kept open the line of communications. Paul in the front, and Tychicus obscure in the rear, the great teachers and path-openers whom Christ through the ages raises up for large spiritual work, and the little people whom Christ through the ages raises up to help and sympathise—shall share alike at last, if the Spirit that moved them has been the same, and in different administrations they have served the same Lord. "He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet"—though no prophecy come from his lips—"shall receive a prophet's reward."

II. We must now turn to a much briefer consideration of the second figure here, Onesimus, as representing the *transforming and uniting power of Christian faith.*

No doubt this is the same Onesimus as we read of in the Epistle to Philemon. His story is familiar and need not be dwelt on. He had been an "unprofitable servant," good-for-nothing, and apparently had robbed his master, and then fled. He had found his way to Rome, to which all the scum of the empire seemed to drift. There he had burrowed in some hole, and found obscurity and security. Somehow or other he had come across Paul—surely not, as has been supposed, having sought the Apostle as a friend of his master's, which would rather have been a reason for avoiding him. However that may be, he had found Paul, and Paul's Master had found *him* by the gospel which Paul spoke. His heart had been touched. And now he is to go back to his owner. With beautiful considerateness the Apostle unites him with Tychicus in his mission, and refers the Church to him as an authority. That is most delicate and thoughtful. The same sensitive regard for his feelings marks the language in which he is commended to them. There is now no word about "a fellow-slave"—that might have been misunderstood and might have hurt.

Paul will only say about him half of what he said about Tychicus. He cannot leave out the "faithful," because Onesimus had been eminently unfaithful, and so he attaches it to the half of his former commendation which he retains, and testifies to him as "a faithful and beloved brother." There are no references to his flight or to his peculations. Philemon is the person to be spoken to about these. The Church has nothing to do with them. The man's past was blotted out—enough that he is "faithful," exercising trust in Christ, and therefore to be trusted. His condition was of no moment—enough that he is "a brother," therefore to be beloved.

Does not then that figure stand forth a living illustration of the *transforming* power of Christianity? Slaves had well known vices, largely the result of their position—idleness, heartlessness, lying, dishonesty. And this man had had his full share of the sins of his class. Think of him as he left Colossæ, slinking from his master, with stolen property in his bosom, madness and mutiny in his heart, an ignorant heathen, with vices and sensualities holding carnival in his soul. Think of him as he came back, Paul's trusted representative, with desires after holiness in his deepest nature, the light of the knowledge of a loving and pure God in his soul, a great hope before him, ready for all service and even to put on again the abhorred yoke! What had happened? Nothing but this—the message had come to him, "Onesimus! fugitive, rebel, thief as thou art, Jesus Christ has died for thee, and lives to cleanse and bless thee. Believest thou this?" And he believed, and leant his whole sinful self on that Saviour, and the corruption faded away from his heart, and out of the thief was made a trustworthy man, and out of the slave a beloved brother. The cross had touched his heart and will. That was all. It had changed his whole being. He is a living illustration of Paul's teaching in this very

letter. He is dead with Christ to his old self; he lives with Christ a new life.

The gospel can do that. It can and does do so to-day and to us, if we will. Nothing else can; nothing else ever has done it; nothing else ever will. Culture may do much; social reformation may do much; but the radical transformation of the nature is only effected by the "love of God shed abroad in the heart," and by the new life which we receive through our faith in Christ.

And that change can be produced on all sorts and conditions of men. The gospel despairs of none. It knows of no hopelessly irreclaimable classes. It can kindle a soul under the ribs of death. The filthiest rags can be cleaned and made into spotlessly white paper, which may have the name of God written upon it. None are beyond its power; neither the savages in other lands, nor the more hopeless heathens festering and rotting in our back slums, the opprobrium of our civilization and the indictment of our Christianity. Take the gospel that transformed this poor slave to them, and some hearts will own it, and we shall pick out of the kennel souls blacker than his, and make them like him, brethren, faithful and beloved.

Further, here is a living illustration of the power which the gospel has of binding men into a true brotherhood. We can scarcely picture to ourselves the gulf which separated the master from his slave. "So many slaves, so many enemies," said Seneca. That great crack running through society was a chief weakness and peril of the ancient world. Christianity gathered master and slave into one family, and set them down at one table to commemorate the death of the Saviour who held them all in the embrace of His great love.

All true union among men must be based upon their oneness in Jesus Christ. The brotherhood of man is a consequence of the fatherhood of God, and Christ shows us

the Father. If the dreams of men's being knit together in harmony are ever to be more than dreams, the power that makes them facts must flow from the cross. The world must recognise that "One is your master," before it comes to believe as anything more than the merest sentimentality that "all ye are brethren."

Much has to be done before the dawn of that day reddens in the east, "when, man to man, the wide world o'er, shall brothers be," and much in political and social life has to be swept away before society is organized on the basis of Christian fraternity. The vision tarries. But we may remember how certainly, though slowly, the curse of slavery has disappeared, and take courage to believe that all other evils will fade away in like manner, until the cords of love shall bind all hearts in fraternal unity, because they bind each to the cross of the Elder Brother, through whom we are no more slaves but sons, and if sons of God, then brethren of one another.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

SURVEY OF RECENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

IT is sad to see Old Testament criticism played at, though sadder still to see it misused in the interests of party. This reflection is suggested by two books on the Pentateuch which claim to be noticed, one of which might be hastily put down as a specimen of play, the other of reckless misuse. It would be unfair, however, to judge of Lenormant's textual analysis of the Book of Genesis by the very unscholarly introduction of the translator, and of Kuenen's critical researches into the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua in the spirit of the *Quarterly Review's* attack (October, 1886, p. 484) on Wellhausen and his English admirers. Lenormant's devout spirit would have been shocked at the irrever-

ence, and his philological conscience would have been dismayed at the pretentious sciolism of his editor, and both Kuenen himself, and all serious students of the Old Testament, must meet the *Quarterly Review's* strange misapprehension of facts with an emphatic protest. It is probable, however, that many friends of the EXPOSITOR will have already read the "communicated" article on Wellhausen and Kuenen in the *Guardian* for November 3rd. That article is not only good in itself, but a fact of high importance for the movement in which all critical students of the Bible must take some part. No one can accuse the writer either of ignorance or of want of tender consideration for religious scruples. He blames advanced Old Testament critics for not distinguishing enough between theories which are tentative and provisional and results which are assured and irresistible, and calls upon theologians to give a patient study to the subject, so as to draw this distinction for themselves, assimilating their theology to the newly discovered facts. Given the inspiration and authority of the Old Testament, what, they have to inquire, were the steps by which the revelation was made, and how does the clearer knowledge of facts enable us to define more precisely the nature of inspiration? Both in Germany and in England, some loyal servants of the Christian Church are awake to the fresh call upon their energies. At first sight, Lenormant would seem to have given preliminary help of great value, for he has attempted, according to his translator, to restore the original documents woven together in one of the most important of the narrative books.[1] I fear it was a premature attempt; even from a friendly point of view, we cannot safely undertake what the title-page promises; much can be done, but not all that we could wish. Still, Lenormant's modest and devoutly written book would have helped some students, and if the international character of Biblical studies were more adequately recognised, it would have passed in its French form into the hands of fitting persons. Unfortunately this is not Lenormant that we have before us; the introduction and notes (excepting the few signed "L.") are the work of a less competent

[1] His book is entitled *The Book of Genesis, a Translation from the Hebrew, in which the Constituent Elements of the Text are separated, to which is added an Attempted Restoration of the Original Documents used by the latest Reviser.* By François Lenormant. Translated from the French, with an Introduction and Notes, by the Author of *Mankind, their Origin and Destiny.* London: Longmans, Green & Co.

hand, and it would not repay the trouble to disentangle the good from the bad.

It has been repeatedly said that, though Biblical critics of the analytic school may have their own favourite theologies *in petto*, yet this does not, at least up to a certain point, affect their criticism. There is a stage in the road, at which Kuenen and Wellhausen part company with Delitzsch and König, and this separation is mainly caused by their different attitude towards orthodox theology. "Orthodox" has a different meaning abroad from that which it still upon the whole retains with us; but there is such a thing as essential orthodoxy, and the presence of this in the mind conditions the critic's line of action at a certain point of the critical process. Such at least is the fact at present; whether it ought to do so—at least in the degree in which some contemporary critics even in Germany allow it do so—the next generation may determine more accurately than the present. Kuenen's *Introduction to the Hexateuch* (Macmillan & Co.), admirably translated by Mr. Wicksteed, is a noble specimen of well directed industry and critical acumen, though orthodox readers may not be able to contemplate at their ease the results (so much more advanced than those of the first edition) at which he arrives. It is a book for teachers, not for ordinary students; for the former, it is of the utmost value, as an introduction into the workshop of a critic of singular gifts who has probably studied the critical aspects of his subject more thoroughly than any of his contemporaries. Kuenen's results are being continually matured, and the details of his arguments corrected, in the light of further study and discussion. The results are in the main well known from his lucid work, *The Religion of Israel* (3 vols., Williams & Norgate, 1874–75); the details must be sought in the present work and in a long series of critical papers in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*. Some may regret the difficult paragraph form in which this *Introduction* is cast; but no one will repent the trouble necessary for its perusal, and it depends on the reader himself whether the effect of Kuenen on his mind is simply to unsettle his opinions, or to purify them and place them on a sounder basis.

The coldness of the Leyden critic is really self-restraint pushed to an extreme. In this he differs materially from Ewald, and still more from the author (Dr. Binnie) of a semi-critical, semi-homiletic work on *The Psalms, their History, Teachings, and Use* (Hodder

and Stoughton). *De mortuis nihil inhonestum.* There is one fault which must not be ignored, even in this legacy of a good man—he is prone to misjudge theologians of other schools. He was evidently not acquainted with Hupfeld, and had not read the *Lebensbild* of that great scholar which Hupfeld's pupil and friend, Dr. Eduard Riehm, published after his decease. Hupfeld's pupils in Scotland and elsewhere may not be numerous, but they will be hurt by these misplaced denunciations of Dr. Binnie. Attacks of this kind are a sign of weakness; life is too short for personal controversy. I have called Dr. Binnie's work semi-critical. It is so in two senses; it is partly concerned with critical questions, and it treats them to some extent in a critical spirit. The author is well aware of the connexion between the study of the Psalms and recent Pentateuch-criticism. Wellhausen, at least, is not unknown to him, and in a careful and sincere pamphlet, published in 1880, he has dealt with the difficult question of "the proposed reconstruction of the Old Testament history." If his criticism is largely coloured by a regard to the practical exigences of the day, those who look forward to a less "exigent" Church of the future cannot blame this faithful Eli for his anxiety for the Church of the present.

The book will doubtless be extensively useful among those who hold to tradition in theology, criticism, and apologetic. The contents are well distributed into three books, the first concerned with the history and poetical structure, the second with the theology, the third with the use of the Psalter in the Church. I cannot dwell on minute points, but will express concurrence with Dr. Binnie in his unfavourable criticism on Hupfeld's view of the Tora-psalms. I am surprised that he does not mention Bishop Alexander's eloquent *Bampton Lectures* on the Psalms, which had certainly appeared before Dr. Binnie's second edition. It is a more serious defect that there is so little exegesis in the book. We could have better spared some of the homiletical applications.

A production of a very different school is *Messianic Prophecy; the Prediction of the Fulfilment of Redemption through the Messiah; a Critical Study of the Messianic Passages of the Old Testament in the Order of their Development.* By C. A. Briggs, D.D. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.) A spirit of hope and of reconciliation breathes throughout the book; the writer takes a middle position in theology, between the extremes of ultra-supernaturalism and

rationalism, and avows his adhesion to the principles of criticism common to Ewald and to Kuenen. The book is the result of experience as a theological professor; and its style is less cultured than one would have desired. There is a world of students outside the class-room. I do not wish to anticipate what Professor Curtiss may say on this in some respects admirable production of American scholarship. The tone and method of the book are what should commend it to those who seek broad but not superficial views. It is thoroughly reverent and yet critical; the author might have taken as his motto those words of Tholuck, "Um zu wissen was man preisgeben kann, muss man wissen was man besitzt." Hebrew students will turn with interest to the notices of the author's further researches into rhythm. His earlier book on *Biblical Study* still awaits much supplementing in this department. Has he the necessary combination of caution and boldness? In the present work he does but whet our curiosity.

T. K. Cheyne.

It is painful to be obliged to pass an unfavourable judgment on what has evidently been a labour of love, but the late Mr. Randolph's *Analytical Notes on the First and Three Last of the Minor Prophets*,[1] can hardly be said to contain much that will be useful to Hebrew students. Grammatical difficulties are treated in a vague and hesitating way, and the kind of direction really needed by "the intermediate class of students," for whom the book is intended, who are neither "ripe scholars" nor "mere beginners," is almost entirely wanting. Still, devout and suggestive remarks are to be found in the Commentary from time to time.

The Commentary on the Pentateuch, Megilloth, and Haphtaroth, known as the *Tseénah Ureénah*[2] (familiarly corrupted into *Zenne Renne*), and intended as the title *Go forth* [O ye daughters of Zion] *and behold*, taken from Cant. iii. 11, implies, for the instruction of women, was an extremely popular book in the eighteenth

[1] *Analytical Notes on the First and Three Last of the Minor Prophets, for the Use of Hebrew Students. With an Appendix on Daniel* ix. 24–27. By the [late] Rev. William Randolph, M.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. London: G. Bell & Sons, 1885.)

[2] צְאֶינָה וּרְאֶינָה *Tseénah ureénah: Go ye and see. A Rabbinical Commentary on Genesis; translated from the Judæo-Polish, with Notes and Indices*, by Paul Isaac Hershon. *With Introductory Preface*, by the Venerable Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1885.)

century. It was written by Rabbi Jacob, who died in 1628, and published, according to Fürst (*Bibl. Jud.*, ii. 19), in 1648, not, as Mr. Hershon states, in 1693 (p. vii.). It is a compilation, mainly drawn from the Talmud and Midrashim, and is amusing rather than instructive. Mr. Hershon has translated the Commentary on Genesis as a specimen of the work, but whether it was worth extracting from the obscurity of the Judæo-Polish dialect in which it is written may well be questioned. At any rate it must not be taken as a serious specimen of Jewish exegesis, though Mr. Hershon says it will enlighten the Gentile reader as to "the true character of the modern schools of Jewish biblical criticism, if indeed Rabbinical Commentary of any kind can be called criticism." "The modern schools" is a sufficiently vague term, but it may be most misleading. A sweeping condemnation of all modern Jewish commentators would be grossly unjust. There are many of them who, even if their methods are often uncritical and their exegesis sometimes fanciful, deserve at least as much respect for their expositions of the O. T. as their Gentile contemporaries.

In the first three of his sermons on *The Discipline of the Christian Character*,[1] the Dean of St. Paul's traces "the religious character, the character of the servant of God, which was in due time to grow up and blossom into 'the mind of Christ,'" as it is "shown to us in the various stages of its growth in the Old Testament, from the first step of realizing God, the faith and self-abandonment of Abraham, and the severe ethical schooling of the law, to the trust of feeling, thought, imagination, affection, which we meet with in the Psalms and the Prophets." With his unrivalled power of insight, delicacy of touch, and charm of style, the Dean analyses the contribution of each of these moments or epochs of the Divine discipline of Israel towards that perfect character which was to be manifested in Christ. Praise of such a book as this seems almost an impertinence.

Alas that the author of *Zechariah: His Visions and Warnings*[2] should have to be designated on the title-page as *the late* Dr. Lindsay Alexander! The volume is a reprint of papers already published in the *Homiletic Magazine*. Their collection and repub-

[1] *The Discipline of the Christian Character.* By R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's, Honorary Fellow of Oriel College. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1885.)

[2] *Zechariah: His Visions and Warnings.* By the late Rev. W. Lindsay Alexander, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E., Edinburgh. (London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1885.)

lication is an act of justice to their author, and a solid boon to readers of Zechariah. Scholarly, suggestive, interesting, they are a model of exposition. They show a thorough knowledge of what the best commentators have said; difficulties are fairly discussed, and a judicious decision between conflicting views given; but the reader is not wearied with an interminable array of opinions cited only to be refuted.

One defect in the book, which cannot be due to the learned author, is annoying. Hebrew words (and the references to the original are numerous), are most incorrectly printed. So frequent are the errors, that it would almost seem as if, by some unfortunate oversight, the proofs had not been read at all so far as the Hebrew is concerned.

Professor Redford's *Four Centuries of Silence*[1] is also a republication of papers which have already appeared in *The Homiletic Magazine*. He is right in insisting upon the importance of a more careful study of the history of the Jewish Church and the developments of Jewish thought in the period between the close of the Old Testament Canon and the Christian era. To many careful readers of the Bible that period is a blank. The Apocrypha is ignored, and the page is turned from Malachi to St. Matthew as if nothing had intervened. Books like Professor Redford's which direct attention to the interval are most useful. Many points in detail may no doubt be criticised. Is it so clear that no book of the Old Testament was written after 400 B.C. (pp. 29, 82)? Prophecy, indeed, ceased with Malachi, but are none of the books of the Hagiographa later? Again, is it certain that there are no traces of the use of the Apocrypha in the New Testament? St. Jude appears to quote even the pseudepigraphic Book of Enoch, and the Epistle of St. James and the Epistle to the Hebrews seem to show an acquaintance with Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. The reference to the Massora in the chapter on the Scribes is misleading, for none of the present Massoretic *apparatus criticus* can be assigned to such an early date; and Professor Redford is much too sanguine if he thinks that Dr. Ginsburg's labours will correct many of the serious corruptions of the Hebrew Text (p. 111). Some influential scholars think that the Targum of Onkelos was not the earlier form, but a later reaction against the extravagance

[1] *Four Centuries of Silence; or, from Malachi to Christ.* By the Rev. R. A. Redford, M.A., LL.B., Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics, New College, London. (London: Nisbet & Co., 1885.)

of paraphrases. The reference to a lost decade of Livy (p. 171) is of course a mere misprint for XLV.; and *Sunedroin* should be *Sunedrion:—senatores quos synedros vocant* are Livy's actual words. But the book will serve a useful end if it interests its readers in this far too much neglected period.

The Religious Tract Society continues its excellent series of popular handbooks illustrating the Bible, entitled *By-paths of Bible Knowledge*.[1] Sir J. W. Dawson writes on the physical features of Egypt and Syria in relation to Bible History. The Delta, the Nile Valley, Judæa and Jerusalem, the Jordan, and the Dead Sea are described; the Geography of the Exodus is discussed by the light of M. Naville's recent identification of the site of Pithom at *Tel-el-Maskhuta;* the traces, real and supposed, of prehistoric men in Syria and Egypt are examined; and the future of the East conjectured.

Professor Sayce gives an interesting sketch of the history, religion, art, literature, science, manners and customs, trade and government of Assyria, and shows how in manifold ways the Assyrian records rescued from the ruins of Nineveh, and deciphered by patient ingenuity, illustrate and confirm the Old Testament.

Mr. Budge tells the story of the decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, describes the religion, literature, and art of the ancient Egyptians, and points out the light thrown on the Pentateuch and other books of the O. T. from Egyptian sources.

These handbooks bring within the reach of every one the means of acquiring a knowledge of the nations which exercised so powerful an influence on the destinies of Israel. Form, maps, and illustrations render them most attractive, and they deserve a wide circulation. Though they are primarily designed for popular use, even more advanced students will find it worth while to refer to them.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.

[1] *By-paths of Bible Knowledge:* VI. *Egypt and Syria; Their Physical Features in Relation to Bible History.* By Sir J. W. Dawson, C.M.G., LL.D., F.R.S. VII. *Assyria; Its Princes, Priests, and People.* By A. H. Sayce, M.A., Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford. VIII. *The Dwellers on the Nile; or, Chapters on the Life, Literature, History, and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians.* By E. A. Wallis Budge, M.A., Assistant in the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum. (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1885.)

SOME LESSONS OF THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. Introductory.

1. It is my purpose in the following papers to offer some hints and helps to those who desire to study the Revised Version of the New Testament. I have no intention of entering into controversy. I shall take the book as it lies in our hands, and endeavour to show what fresh lessons we may learn from it. I shall assume therefore that my readers are anxious to use to the best purpose the fresh materials which the Revised Version offers for the understanding of the apostolic writings; and that to this end they will test for themselves the typical illustrations which I shall give of the purpose and nature of the changes which the Revisers have introduced.

I have, I say, no intention of entering into controversy; but I shall be disappointed if those who are able to follow out the lines of inquiry which I shall suggest, do not feel in the end, that most of the popular objections which are brought against the Revision are either altogether groundless, or outweighed by corresponding gains.

2. These objections, dealing with textual changes, and "pedantic literality," and "faulty rhythm," and the like, were of course constantly present to the Revisers during their ten years' labour. They are perfectly natural. Objections of a similar character and no less violent in expression were directed against Jerome's Latin Version, which in due time became "the Vulgate" of the Western Church, and

the Version of Tyndale, and the Revision of 1611;[1] and it has certainly been a satisfaction to those who gave time and thought to the work, that no criticism has come upon them by surprise. They heard in the Jerusalem Chamber all the arguments against their conclusions which they have heard since; and I may say for myself, without the least reserve, that no restatement of old arguments has in the least degree shaken my confidence in the general results which were obtained.

3. It has been, I repeat, a satisfaction to the Revisers to find, from the attacks which have been made upon their work that they were able to take account of all that could be said against the conclusions which they deliberately adopted

[1] A single illustration will be sufficient. Among the most indefatigable English Biblical students of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. was Hugh Broughton, some time Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. He had published, in 1597, "an Epistle to the learned Nobility of England, touching translating the Bible from the original, with ancient warrant for every word, with the full satisfaction of any that be of heart"; and afterwards separate translations of Daniel, Job, and Lamentations. He was not, however, included among the Revisers, when "in 1607 the translation of the Bible was begun, from which work why he was secluded, whose abilities that way were known so well, may rather be wondered at, than resolved." But the surprise which Lightfoot thus expresses will hardly be felt by any one who has considered Broughton's manner towards those who differed from him.

When the revision appeared, Broughton sent a brief notice of it to "a right worshipful knight, attendant upon the king": "The late Bible (Right Worshipful) was sent me to censure, which bred in me a sadness that will grieve me while I breathe. It is so ill done. Tell his Majesty that I had rather be rent in pieces with wild horses than any such translation by my consent should be urged upon poor churches." He then gives ten points in which opinions that he had advocated were not adopted, and concludes: "I blame not this, that they keep the usual style of former translations in the Church, that the people should not be amazed. For the learned, the Geneva might be made exact; for which pains whole thirty years I have been called upon, and spent much time to my great loss, by wicked hindrance. When you find the king at leisure, show his Majesty this short advertisement. And if his Highness bid me again, as once by the Earl of Pembroke, show faulty places, I will in a few sheets translate what I blame most, that they might be sent to all churches that have bought Bibles. So all may be well pacified. The king meant royally; but froward would be froward; who have felt it as I was sure they would. . . ."

So the learned and impracticable scholar wrote; but in due time the judgment of English-speaking Christendom went against him.

with a full sense of their responsibility. But it is a far deeper satisfaction to them that their work has given a powerful impulse to a close and patient investigation of the apostolic texts. And the claim which they confidently make—the claim which alone could justify their labours—is that they have placed the English reader far more nearly than before in the position of the Greek scholar; that they have made it possible for him to trace out innumerable subtleties of harmonious correspondence between different parts of the New Testament which were hitherto obscured; that they have given him a copy of the original which is marked by a faithfulness unapproached, I will venture to say, by any other ecclesiastical version. And while they have done this, they have at the same time given him the strongest possible assurance of the substantial soundness of the familiar English rendering which they have reviewed with the most candid and unreserved criticism.

4. This endeavour after faithfulness was indeed the ruling principle of the whole work. From first to last, the single object of the Revisers was to allow the written words to speak to Englishmen for themselves, without any admixture of gloss, or any suppression of roughness. Faithfulness must, indeed, be the supreme aim of the Biblical translator. In the record of a historical Revelation no sharp line can be drawn between the form and the spirit. The form is the spirit. The Bible is, we believe, not only a collection of most precious literary monuments, but the original charter of our Faith. No one can presume to say that the least variation is unimportant. The translator, at any rate, is bound to place all the facts in evidence, as far as it is possible for him to do so. He must feel that in such a case he has no right to obscure the least shade of expression which can be rendered; or to allow any prepossessions as to likelihood or fitness to outweigh direct evidence, and still less any attractiveness of a graceful

phrase to hinder him from applying most strictly the ordinary laws of criticism to the determination and to the rendering of the original text. He will accept, without the least misgiving, the canon that the Bible must be interpreted "like any other book"; and his reward will be, to find that it is by the use of this reverent freedom he becomes assured with a conviction, rational and immovable, that it is not like any other book.

5. Difficulties and differences of opinion necessarily arise in determining the relative claims of faithfulness and elegance of idiom when they come into conflict. But the example of the Authorised Version seems to show that it is better to incur the charge of harshness, than to sacrifice a peculiarity of language, which, if it does nothing else, arrests attention, and reminds the reader that there is something in the words which is held to be more precious than the music of a familiar rhythm. The Bible, indeed, has most happily enriched our language with many turns of Hebrew idiom,[1] and I believe that the Revision of the N.T. does not contain anything unusual either in expression or in order which is not justified by the Old Version.

6. But it will be observed that the continuous effort to give in the Revision an exact representation of the original text, has necessarily led to a large number of minute changes in form and order. We shall see afterwards, I trust, the reason of many of these variations. I notice them now in passing, because such comparatively trivial changes arrest the attention of the reader first, and he is inclined to ask, as the Revisers were constantly asking themselves, Is it worth while? With their experience and their responsibility, he would, I believe, feel regret that here and there they lost the courage of their convictions, and so have failed to conform even such details as "heaven" and "heavens" rigorously to the Greek forms.

[1] Who, for example, would alter, "With desire I have desired" (Luke xxii. 15)?

7. Substantial variations of text and rendering are matters of more serious importance. We might, perhaps, have wished, in thoughtless haste, that there had been no room for doubt as to the apostolic words or as to their exact meaning. But further reflection will show how greatly we gain by the fact that the record of revelation, even as the revelation itself, comes to us in the way of human life, exercising every power of man, and hallowing the service of his whole nature. The fact, when we face it, is seen to be a part of our religious discipline. And a version of the New Testament for popular use and study, ought to take account of the existence of variations in the reading of the original text, and of conflicting interpretations of it. There can be no legitimate authority, no prescription of use, to decide questions of criticism. When the Caliph Othman fixed a text of the Koran and destroyed all the old copies which differed from his standard, he provided for the uniformity of subsequent MSS. at the cost of their historical foundation. A classical text which rests finally on a single archetype is that which is open to the most serious suspicions. A book which is free from all ambiguities can hardly deal with the last problems of human experience, or give natural expression to human feelings and impressions.

In both these respects—in the determination of the Greek text and in the translation of it—the Revised Version exhibits a loyal regard to wide general consent tested again and again by successive discussions. It exhibits no preponderance of private opinion. It is, so to speak, the resultant of many conflicting forces. Each Reviser gladly yielded his own conviction to more or less serious opposition. Each school, among the Revisers, if the term may be used, prevailed in its turn, yet so as to leave on record the opinion which failed to obtain acceptance. The margin, therefore, offers the reader continually alternative

readings and renderings, which form one of the most important lessons of the Revision.

8. It is true that individual critics may be able to satisfy their own doubts, to lay down with confidence exactly what the Apostles wrote and what they meant, but the ablest and best-disciplined scholars, no less than the boldest, know that their conclusions do not find universal acceptance. They will be the last to wish, even if they were able, to impose the peculiarities of their private convictions upon a popular and public work. But experience gradually fixes the area of debate within recognised limits; and a faithful version of the N.T. will take account of all cases of reasonable uncertainty. This the Revised Version has done with general (if not uniform) consistency and completeness. And in this respect there is no feature of the Revised Version which is more important than the margin. For the margin contains a compact record of such variations in reading and rendering as seemed to the Company, by a repeated vote, to require consideration. The margin, it must be remembered, is an integral part of the revision. It very frequently records the opinion of the majority of the Revisers. And it is the more important to lay stress on this point, because it is constantly overlooked, not only by the assailants of the work, but also by careful students.

9. The Revision consists in fact of four distinct elements, of which the reader must take separate account.

(1) The continuous English text.

(2) The alternative readings in the margin.

(3) The alternative renderings in the margin.

(4) The American suggestions, which are printed in an Appendix.

Let me endeavour to show how the student will estimate the value of their several elements in relation to the Authorised Version.

Four main cases will arise, according as there is or is

not a note upon any particular passage in the margin or in the Appendix.

(*a*) The Revised Version may agree with the Authorised Version, without any margin or comment.

(*b*) The R.V. may differ from the A.V. without any margin or comment.

(*c*) The R.V. may agree with the A.V., with a margin or comment, or both.

(*d*) The R.V. may differ from the A.V., with a margin or comment, or both.

The first case includes the main body of the English text; and in regard to this the reader has the fullest possible assurance that it adequately represents in substance, form and expression, the original Greek.

The second case includes a large proportion of the changes made in the revision; and here the reader has an assurance of the validity of the English text scarcely less complete than in the former case. He knows that the text as it stands was for the most part approved or acquiesced in by all the members of the English and American Companies, who took part in the final revision of the passage; for it very rarely happened that a strong opinion, even of a small minority, failed to obtain recognition in the margin.

The two remaining cases require to be very carefully distinguished.

If the text of the R.V. gives the reading or rendering of the A.V. with a margin, it is sufficient that the text should have been supported by one-third of the Company who voted on the question, while the margin may record the judgment of the remaining two-thirds.[1] If on the other hand the text presents the change, then this change must have approved itself to at least two-thirds of the scholars who took part in the division. The A.V. in other words, and the Greek text which presumably it renders, had a

[1] See *Rule* 5, and the *Revisers' Preface*, iii. § 1.

preference in the proportion of two to one. Such a preference was a reasonable safeguard against the influence of private opinion; and the general and perfectly independent concurrence of the American Revisers in the results which were finally adopted by the English Company, shows how well-fitted these simple rules were to secure a Greek text and a rendering suited by the common consent of Biblical scholars for ordinary use.

10. Let me, even at the risk of tediousness, illustrate these various cases by examples taken from the first chapter of St. John's Gospel.

I need say nothing of the general coincidence of the Authorised and Revised Versions. Nearly eight-ninths of the old words remain wholly unchanged; and here, as elsewhere, careful attention is needed to note the differences. Yet there are differences between the Old and and the New, and those of moment. And it may be added that changes due to changed readings in the original Greek form about one-sixth of the whole number.

11. There are variations both in reading and in rendering which are adopted without any margin; for example, in *v.* 27, the words *who is preferred before me*, were omitted by the English Company by general consent: and again in *v.* 14, the rendering *the Word became flesh* was similarly adopted without difference of opinion for *the Word was made flesh.*

The American Revisers make no comment on these changes. The reader may therefore accept these changes as practically unquestionable; and they are types, as I said, of a large proportion of the changes in the revision.

12. So far we have dealt with results which represent substantial unanimity among the Revisers; but there are also marginal notes both on readings and on renderings. These record differences of opinion in the Companies, and illustrate the third and fourth cases.

Thus in *v.* 18 there is a very remarkable reading. The text preserves the words of A.V. *the only begotten Son;* but we find in the margin "Many very ancient authorities read *God only begotten.*" The English reader therefore will know that at least one-third (if not more) of those who voted on the question of reading were in favour of the reading rendered by the Authorised Version; and on referring to the American Appendix he will find that the American Revisers did not dissent from their judgment. But the marginal reading may express the opinion of a majority of the English Company, and in fact did so.

In *v.* 28 the R.V. reads *Bethany* for the A.V. *Bethabara.* Here therefore at least two-thirds of the members who voted (and not as before, one-third) must have supported the reading *Bethany;* while the margin records the variations which were set aside by the majority.

13. From disputed readings we pass to disputed renderings, to which also the same rule applies, requiring a majority of two-thirds for a variation from A.V. in the text.

In *v.* 29 the rendering of A.V. (*which*) *taketh away the sin* (*of the world*) is kept with the margin or *beareth the sin.* It is therefore at least possible that a majority of the English Revisers preferred the margin; but in that case they were not supported by the American Company, who do not propose any change. On the other hand it will be seen that the American Revisers wish to substitute the rendering *through* for *by* in *vv.* 3, 10, 17, and their concurrence with the margin against A.V. suggests the true inference that there was in the English Company a preponderance of opinion in favour of the margin, though less than two to one.

In *v.* 5, the rendering of A.V. *comprehended* was not supported by one-third of the English Revisers. Of the other renderings which were advocated, *apprehended* was adopted

by a simple majority, with the variant *overcame*, and in this conclusion the American Company agreed.

14. It may be worth while to notice another form of margin, which calls attention to the exact form of the original. Thus in *v.* 14 on *dwelt* we read the note "Greek *tabernacled*." The peculiar word is marked in order to bring to the reader's mind two passages of the Apocalypse: vii. 15, *He that sitteth on the throne shall spread His tabernacle over them;* xxi. 3, *Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men.*

15. I shall have an opportunity hereafter, I hope, of calling attention to some of the marginal notes. I wish now only to point out one most important service which they render to the English reader. They show with fair accuracy and completeness the extent of the uncertainty which attaches to the Greek text and to the literal rendering of the text. Popular controversy is apt to convey a false view of this uncertainty, by dwelling on a few passages of exceptional interest. In this respect nothing, I believe, can be more reassuring to the ordinary student than to notice the number and the character of the variants in a chapter or a book, and to remember that, with these exceptions, the text in his hands represents the united and deliberate judgment of a larger and more varied body of scholars than has ever on any other occasion discussed together a version of the N.T. into another language.

16. I have said that faithfulness, the most candid and the most scrupulous, was the central aim of the Revisers; but perfect faithfulness is impossible. No two languages are absolutely commensurate in vocabulary and construction. Biblical English is indeed, I believe, the best modern representative of Biblical Greek, but still it cannot preserve all the suggestive features of the original. The best translation can be no more than an imperfect copy, made in different materials: under the most favourable circumstances, an engraving, as it were, of the master's drawing.

Thus the student of a version of the N.T. will take account of the difficulties which beset the translator, before he passes judgment on the work; and nothing will tend so powerfully to remove the objections to a version necessarily imperfect, as a just estimate of the complexity of the questions involved in rendering words which we feel to be "living oracles." I am anxious, therefore, to help English readers to feel how arduous the work of revision was, before I enter on a consideration of the changes which were made in the Revision.

17. Sometimes a single Greek word conveys a fulness of meaning for which we have no English equivalent expression. *Repent*, to take one example only, is nearer in thought to the Greek than *agite pœnitentiam* of the Latin Vulgate (inadequately rendered in the Rhemish Version, *do penance*), but it falls far short of the idea of a complete moral change which is described by the Greek μετανοεῖτε, and it has to do duty (with a slight modification) for a very different word (Matt. xxi. 29, 33; xxvii. 3; Heb. vii. 21, *repent himself:* yet see 2 Cor. vii. 8, *regret*; comp. 2 Cor. vii. 10).

18. Sometimes terms in a series of forms connected in Greek are supplied in English from different roots. Thus we say *righteous*, *righteousness*, *justify*, *justification*. We have indeed the words *just*, and *justice;* but even if we could without loss use "just" for "righteous," we could not substitute "justice" for "righteousness," or "injustice" for "unrighteousness," without introducing great confusion of thought.

So again the close connexion which is often deeply impressive in the original between *faith*, *faithful*, *believe*, *believer*, is necessarily lost (*e.g.* John xx. 27, 29; 1 John v. 4, 5; and for another example, 2 Cor. v. 6, 8).[1]

[1] In like manner, it is impossible to mark in a translation the connexion of "Christ" and "Christians" which is emphasised in 2 Cor. i. 21; 1 John ii. 20 *ff.* (Χριστός, χρίω, χρίσμα).

19. Synonymes offer peculiar difficulties. Greek, for example, distinguishes sharply two types of *love* and two types of *knowledge*, and these distinctions give a power and pathos to the charge of the Risen Lord to St. Peter, which cannot be reproduced in an English translation (John xxi. 15–17). Here the margin directs the careful reader to seek for fuller light; but it would be scarcely possible to adopt this expedient in John xx. 2, compared with xxi. 20, though the use of different words for "love" in the two places has an important bearing on the interpretation of the former verse. Examples of the contrast of the two words for "know," which cannot be expressed in English except by a paraphrase, are of constant occurrence: *e.g.* Mark iv. 13; John xiii. 7; Rom. vi. 6, 9 (compare for another kind of example, Matt. xvi. 9 *ff.*).

So again the phrase "good works" stands necessarily for two distinct phrases, in one of which the word for "good" (*ἀγαθός*) marks the essential moral character of the actions, and in the other (*καλός*) their attractive nobility, as when the word "good" is applied to "the good Shepherd" (Heb. x. 24).

To take examples of a somewhat different kind, the original Greek distinguishes the "weeping" of Jesus by the grave of Lazarus (John xi. 35, *ἐδάκρυσεν* only here), from his "weeping" over Jerusalem (Luke xix. 41, *ἔκλαυσεν*); the one loud cry of the excited multitude (John xviii. 40 *ἐκραύγασαν*), from their reiterated clamour (John xix. 12, *ἔκραζον*); the many different utterances (*ῥήματα*) which are "words of eternal life" (John vi. 68), from the one "word of life," the unchanging Gospel (1 John i. 1); the one abiding mission of the Son from the mission of those sent in His Name (John xx. 21, *ἀπέσταλκα, πέμπω*).[1]

[1] It would be easy to multiply examples of synonymes which cannot be distinguished easily and naturally in an English Version. The student will find it worth while to consider a few. *Ἀνήρ, ἄνθρωπος*: John viii. 40; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Acts ii. 22; xvii. 31—Acts xxi. 39; xxii. 3; but still notice John vi. 10, R.V.

20. So far I have spoken only of questions of vocabulary. Difficulties increase when we take account of grammatical forms and construction.

It is especially in the power of its tenses that Greek is unapproachable by modern languages. A slight change of form in the verb distinguishes at once an action which is inceptive or continuous from one which is complete in idea and execution. Thus when we read in John xix. 2, 3, *The soldiers arrayed Him in a purple garment; and they came unto Him, and said, Hail, King of the Jews!* there is in English no distinction in the verbs; but the Greek, by a simple and most natural change of tense, draws a vivid picture of the stream of soldiers coming one after another to do mock homage to the King once invested in the imperial robe (comp. Acts viii. 17). So again when it is said in Rom. vi. 13, *Neither present your members; . . . but present yourselves unto God, . . .* the distinction marked in the original between the successive acts of sin and the one supreme act of self-surrender which carries all else with it is necessarily lost.

Sometimes the idea of purpose, or of beginning, or of repetition, conveyed by the imperfect, can be expressed simply, *e.g.*:

Matt. iii. 14, John *would have hindered* him.

Luke i. 22, *he continued making* signs.

,, i. 59, they *would have called* him (comp. iv. 42).

,, viii. 23, they *were filling* with water.

,, xviii. 3, she *came oft* unto him.

Acts xxvi. 11, *strove to make* them blaspheme.

And so also the corresponding sense of the present, *e.g.*:

Matt. xxv. 8, our lamps *are going out.*

Ἀληθής, ἀληθινός: John xix. 35—1 John ii. 8, etc. Βωμός, θυσιαστήριον: Acts xvii. 23; Luke xi. 51. Λαμβάνειν, παραλαμβάνειν: John i. 11 *f.* Λαός, δῆμος: Acts xii. 4, 11, 22; xvii. 5; xix. 4, 30, 33. Περιελεῖν, ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας: Heb. x. 4, 11. Νέος, καινός: Heb. xii. 24; ix. 15—Col. iii. 10; yet notice Matt. ix. 17, R.V. Φίλος, ἑταῖρος: Matt. xxii. 12; xxvi. 50; John xv. 13, 14, 15.

Gal. v. 4, ye who *would be justified* by the law.

Sometimes, as I cannot but think, the Revisers have shrunk too much from an apparent heaviness of rendering, and so lost the full effect of the original. Thus (for example) in Luke xxi. 20, the sign of the desolation of Jerusalem was the gathering of the hosts, and not the complete investment of the city (*being compassed*, not *compassed*); and again in John vii. 37, there is a contrast between the attitude of watchful, expectant waiting (*was standing*) and the sharp, decisive cry which followed. But in very many cases the vividness of the original is unavoidably lost in the translation; and the commentator only can mark it in a paraphrase.[1]

21. The Greek article again gives the language a singular power of expressing subtle and significant shades of meaning. Greek, for example, distinguishes clearly between that which has a particular quality and that which presents the type or ideal of the quality under the particular point of

[1] This subject will come before us again (ii. §§ 6, 7). The student will find instructive illustrations in the following passages:—

Matt. viii. 9, πορεύθητι . . . ἔρχου . . .
,, xvi. 24, ἀράτω . . . καὶ ἀκολουθείτω . . .
,, xxiii. 3, ποιήσατε . . . καὶ τηρεῖτε.
,, xxv. 5, ἐνύσταξαν . . . καὶ ἐκάθευδον.
,, xxvi. 38, μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε.
,, xxvii. 30, ἔλαβον τὸν κάλαμον καὶ ἔτυπτον . . . (comp. Mark xv. 19).
Mark xiv. 35, ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . . .
Luke xviii. 13, ἔτυπτε τὸ στῆθος.
John xi. 29, ἠγέρθη . . . καὶ ἤρχετο.
Acts iv. 31, ἐπλήσθησαν . . . καὶ ἐλάλουν . . .
,, xiv. 10, ἅλατο καὶ περιεπάτει.
1 Pet. ii. 17, τιμήσατε . . . τιμᾶτε . . .
,, v. 5, ὑποτάγητε: Col. iii. 18, ὑποτάσσεσθε.
1 Cor. vii. 14, ἡγίασται.
,, xi. 23, παρεδίδοτο.
Gal. vi. 2, βαστάζετε . . . ἀναπληρώσατε . . .
Eph. ii. 22, συνοικοδομεῖσθε (comp. Col. ii. 7, ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι).
,, iv. 22 *f.*, ἀποθέσθαι . . . φθειρόμενον . . . ἀνανεοῦσθαι . . . ἐνδύσασθαι . . . κτισθέντα . . .
Phil. ii. 6, ἡγήσατο.
2 Tim. iv. 5, νῆφε . . . κακοπάθησον . . .

view, the ideal righteousness (for example) towards which men are ever striving (Matt. v. 6, *τὴν δικαιοσύνην*) and that partial righteousness which in detail embodies it (*id.* 10, *δικαιοσύνης*); salvation as a state and the salvation which crowned the Divine purpose of love (John iv. 22, *ἡ σωτηρία*); that which appears under the form of law, and "the law"; and, in another relation, the Son, and Him who is Son (Heb. i. 2). Such differences cannot in many cases be reproduced in English; though it has happened sometimes that the Revisers have failed, through fear of unusual phraseology, to express a turn of thought which might have been expressed (*e.g.* Rom. iii. 21–23).[1]

22. So again, while the English idiom commonly specialises a predicative noun, the Greek leaves it simply predicative. Thus we say naturally "he is the shepherd of the sheep," as the one to whom the title belongs, or "a shepherd of the sheep," as one of many; but the Greek emphasises the character, "he is shepherd of the sheep" (John x. 2).

23. Another advantage which is perfectly possessed by Greek is only imperfectly represented in English, that of distinguishing between a predicate which simply defines character and a predicate which is identical with the subject. For example, when we say "*Sin is lawlessness*" (1 John iii. 4), we may mean one of two distinct things: either that sin has this feature of lawlessness among others, or that sin and lawlessness are convertible terms. The Greek admits no ambiguity, and, by presenting sin as identical with violation of law, gives a view of the nature of sin which is of the highest practical importance.

24. In Greek, again, the unemphatic personal pronouns are included in the verbal forms. We cannot, except by

[1] See also Matt. vii. 13, *ἡ ἀπώλεια*; Luke xviii. 13, *τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ*; John xii. 24, *ὁ κόκκος*; xvi. 21, *ἡ γυνή*; Acts xi. 18, *ἡ μετάνοια*; xx. 21, *ἡ εἰς τὸν Θεὸν μετάνοια*; 1 Cor. xi. 3, *ἡ κεφαλή, κεφαλή*. On *Θεός* and *ὁ Θεός*, see additional note to 1 John iv. 12.

some device of printing, determine whether in the words "*ye think that in them ye have eternal life*" (John v. 39) the emphasis lies upon the false supposition (ye *think*), or upon the character of the people addressed (*ye* think). The Greek, by expressing the pronoun, leaves no doubt. The Lord contrasts the type of Pharisaic character with that of the true disciple; and then in the following clause the full stress can be laid on the want of moral purpose: "and ye *will not* come to Me."[1]

25. Yet once more: the eloquent significance of the original order is often untranslatable (*e.g.* Luke xxii. 48; John iii. 2; Rom. i. 14, 17, 18; vi. 3; 17 Cor. xiv. 12; Heb. i. 5). Sometimes, however, it can be preserved; *e. g.*:

Luke xxii. 33, Lord, *with thee* I am ready. . . .

,, xxiii. 25, but *Jesus* he delivered up. . . .

1 Cor. v. 7, for *our Passover* hath been sacrificed, *even Christ.*

Gal. v. 25, *by the Spirit* let us also walk.

Heb. ii. 9, we behold *Him who hath been made a little lower* than the angels, *even Jesus.*

Heb. xii. 1, therefore *let us also,* seeing we are compassed about. . . .

26. These illustrations, a few taken from an endless number, will show how many questions must present themselves to the translator of the N.T. at every turn. There is not one detail that I have mentioned which a reader would not be glad to have made plain, if it could be done. Not one, I believe, was left unconsidered in the process of revision. And those who have followed me so far will, I think, be prepared to be patient and sympathetic

[1] Other instructive examples are found in Matt. vi. 9; xiii. 18; xxviii. 5; John iv. 38; xi. 49; xii. 20; xv. 16; xviii. 21; Acts iv. 7; 2 Cor. xi. 29; James ii. 3. So also it is impossible in many cases to give the force of αὐτός and ἐκεῖνος (John xviii. 17), though an attempt has sometimes been made to do so: Matt. i. 21; Acts xx. 35.

critics, both of what has been done, and of what has been left undone. The points raised seem perhaps to be small in themselves: they are not small in their total effect. It is by studying them in their whole range that the reader gains the assurance, that the words of the Bible are living words.

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

II. CRITICISM OF RECENT THEORIES.

IN attempting to criticise the theories of which an outline was given in the last paper, it will be enough if we set before ourselves the latest and most complete, that of Dr. Harnack. This has the advantage over the others, that it has appeared since the epoch-making publication of the *Didaché*, and takes full account of that document. In criticising it, we shall be really criticising the rest, which are to a large extent embodied in it.

It will be enough, too, if we follow the lines of the last paper, and single out especially those points which are most open to question. These will be (1) the origin ascribed to the name and office of the ἐπίσκοπος, (2) the non-equivalence of the terms ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος, (3) the account that is given of the origin of the more spiritual functions of the Christian ministry, and their gradual transference to the officers who now exercise them.

Among these debateable points there is no reason to include the origin of the diaconate and presbyterate. As to the first, no one seems disposed to question the account given in Acts vi.: and as to the second, we are indebted

to Dr. Hatch for calling attention to the difference between synagogue and *συνέδριον*; but on the main point—the Jewish origin and affinities of the office—recent critics appear to be agreed. On the functions of the presbyterate something will be said under our third head.

I. In regard to the term *ἐπίσκοπος*, I confess that I cannot quite satisfy myself as to the evidence which has been adduced to show that this was a standing title for the financial officer of the clubs or guilds which existed in such numbers throughout the more civilized parts of the Roman Empire. Of the two terms which Dr. Hatch quotes in this connexion (*Bamp. Lect.*, p. 37), the evidence seems to be rather better for *ἐπιμελητής*, which unfortunately does not help us. Dr. Hatch remarks: "There is this further point to be noted in reference to these names, that they were used not only in private associations, but also in municipalities; and that they were there applied not only to permanent or quasi-permanent officers, but also to the governing body, or a committee of the governing body, when entrusted with the administration of funds for any special purpose. The *βουλευταί* of a city or a division, or a committee of them, were for the time being, in relation to such administration, *ἐπιμεληταί* or *ἐπίσκοποι*" (pp. 37, 38). This is doubtless true; but a greater body of proof is needed to show that the few allusions that are found to *ἐπίσκοποι* in connexion with associations or temple worship may not have the same extraordinary and occasional character.

The passage most distinctly in point is that which is quoted by Dr. Hatch (as it had been by Bp. Lightfoot), from an inscription found at Thera: *Δεδόχθαι ἀ[ποδε]ξαμένος τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τὸ μ[ὲν ἀρ]γύριον ἐγδανεῖσαι τὸς ἐπισκό[πος] Δίωνα καὶ Μελέϊππον*, "Resolved that the *ἐπίσκοποι* Dion and Meleippus should accept the offer and put out the money at interest." But this falls short by several steps of

complete proof of what is required. It needs to be shown: (1) that the ἐπίσκοποι were permanent officers, (2) that their duties related only, or primarily, to finance.[1]

The other instances to which Dr. Hatch refers seem to be still less conclusive. The word occurs several times in inscriptions collected from the *Haurân* (*Auranitis*, the south-eastern district of the ancient Bashan), by M. Waddington (*Voyage Archéologique*, tome iii.). In none of these are there any precise particulars as to the functions of the ἐπίσκοπος. Indeed, the number mentioned—two or three in No. 1,989, four in No. 1,990, five in No. 2,298—seems to be unnecessarily large for the standing financial officers of a single corporation. In the associations described by M. Foucart (*Associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, inscr. 6, 26), only one such officer is mentioned, who is called ταμίας; the term ἐπίσκοπος occurs, but with very vague functions attached to it.

In discussing the inscription, No. 1,990, M. Waddington compares the ἐπίσκοπος to the ἀγορανόμοι, or "clerks of the market," who regulated the price of provisions, and imposed fines for the breach of their regulations. He points to the comparative frequency of the title in inscriptions from the *Haurân*, and takes occasion to express the opinion that the Christian use of the word is not connected with

[1] Dr. Hatch remarks on this criticism, which he has seen, (1) that he is wrongly supposed to lay any exclusive or even especial stress upon the financial character of the ἐπίσκοποι: he refers me to *B. L.*, p. 36, where they are described as "officers of *administration and* finance"; (2) that the name ἐπιμεληταί had been appropriated by the Essenes, and so was less suited for Christian use; (3) that he does not think it necessary to prove that the ἐπίσκοποι in Gentile associations were *permanent* officers: he is quite prepared to believe that the corresponding Christian office was in the first instance temporary, but that it became permanent through the permanence of the need for it. Another point to which Dr. Hatch calls my attention is that the διάκονος were not necessarily young men: a deacon did not become a presbyter by mere lapse of time, but might remain a deacon all his life. This, as I freely admit, has a bearing on what is said below. I only infer from the names that there may have been a distinction in age between ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι on their first appointment, which was not afterwards maintained as a set rule.

the organization of the Greek municipality, but took its rise in Syria or Palestine.[1]

I am tempted to add another suggestion to those which have been already made on this subject. No doubt it is true that the term ἐπίσκοποι might be used of the overseers of a work. It is probably also true that it might be used of the administrators of a fund. But is it not possible that in its Christian application it denoted in the first instance not so much "overseers of a certain *work*," as "overseers" or "superintendents of certain *persons*"? It appears to be admitted on all hands that the diaconate was a novel institution, devised by the first Christians for a special practical purpose.[2] The deacons seem to have been chosen, as they are chosen now, from the younger men. And is it not a simple hypothesis to suppose that the ἐπίσκοποι were elders who were afterwards appointed to exercise supervision over them?[3]

Or rather, I would not restrict the connotation of the word too narrowly. The "bishops" were in the first instance "superintendents": and there is no necessity to specify exactly what they superintended; it may have been the work, or it may have been the persons, or more probably perhaps both combined. The leading feature in the suggestion is that the word arose in the same manner as διάκονος, and as correlative to it. We might suppose that both names grew rather out of popular usage than from any official and authoritative nomenclature. In the case of the deacons we find διακονεῖν and διακονία before we find διά-

[1] Compare Kühl, *Die Gemeindeverfassung in den Pastoralbriefen* (Berlin, 1885), p. 94.

[2] Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 187.

[3] I see that the main point in this suggestion—that the name ἐπίσκοπος was given in the same way as διάκονος—has already been made by Dr. Kühl. I had forgotten this, and was building far more consciously on the data supplied by Bp. Lightfoot. I cannot, however, agree with Dr. Kühl, that the idea of the ἐπίσκοπος was taken from domestic arrangements, and that the word is used as an equivalent for ἐπίτροπος, "house-steward" (p. 123). The O. T. parallels seem to me far more to the purpose.

κονος. The Seven themselves are not called "deacons" in the Acts. It is true that we find ἐπίσκοπος in Acts xx. 28 and in Phil. i. 1: but the word is evidently well established when first we find it, and it is possible that ἐπισκοπεῖν may have preceded it, as in the common text of 1 Pet. v. 2. If διάκονος is a natural word for young men appointed to the duties described in Acts vi. 1–3, ἐπίσκοπος would be equally natural for seniors appointed to a similar office.

This hypothesis at least fulfils, as I cannot help thinking, better than any other with which I am acquainted, what seems to be the first condition of such a hypothesis, viz. that it should place bishops and deacons in some real organic connexion. Dr. Hatch and Dr. Harnack have abundantly proved that this connexion did exist, and that the deacon stood to the bishop in a far more intimate relation than that in which he stood to the presbyter.

If our hypothesis were true, there would be a sense in which the bishops might rightly be described as successors of the Apostles. The deacons were at first appointed to help the Apostles in a certain locality. The Apostles were their ἐπίσκοποι for that locality. But such an arrangement could only last as long as the Church was a compact body, the greater part of which was resident in Jerusalem under the eye of the Twelve. As soon as it began to enlarge itself, and to throw out colonies as far away as to Antioch, an extension would become necessary. The extension would be provided for by the appointment of ἐπίσκοποι, who would thus do for the deacons, where the Apostles were absent, what the Apostles themselves did, where they were present. The main difference would be, that whereas it was only an accident that the Apostles were settled in any particular city, in the case of the ἐπίσκοποι localization was the rule; they were specially appointed to a particular Church. It would almost seem as if some such process as this were inevitable.

One of the reasons which seems especially to commend this theory of the origin of the episcopate, is that according to it the use of the name would be linked on directly to the usage of the Old Testament. "In the LXX.," says Dr. Lightfoot, "the word is common. In some places it signifies "inspectors, superintendents, task-masters," as 2 Kings xi. 19; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12, 17; Isa. lx. 17; in others it is a higher title, "captains" or "presidents," Neh. xi. 9, 14, 22. Of Antiochus Epiphanes we are told that when he determined to overthrow the worship of the one true God, he "appointed commissioners (ἐπισκόπους, bishops) over all the people," to see that his orders were obeyed (1 Macc. i. 51; comp. Joseph., *Ant.*, xii. 5, 4; in 2 Macc. v. 22 the word is ἐπιστάτας). The feminine ἐπισκοπή, which is not a classical word, occurs very frequently in the LXX., denoting sometimes the work, sometimes the office of an ἐπίσκοπος. Hence it passed into the language of the New Testament and of the Christian Church." If ἐπισκοπή had its origin in the usage of the LXX., is it not reasonable to derive ἐπίσκοπος from the same source?

I have indeed no objection on principle to the use of analogies from the Greek and Roman civil or religious organizations, but where the option is given of going either to these or to the LXX. for the groundwork of a theory, the latter seems to me distinctly preferable. The legislators of the infant Church, and the framers of such constitution as it possessed in its earliest stages, would naturally be the Apostles. But the Apostles were before all things Jews. Even St. Paul, the boldest and most enterprising spirit among them, was trained in the Rabbinical schools, and brought up on the Bible. He was certainly familiar with the LXX.: and if either he or any of his colleagues had occasion to give a name to a new institution, that was likely to be largely used amongst the Churches of the

Dispersion, it would be to the LXX. that his thoughts would naturally turn. The same would be true of the Christian democracy, if the name took its rise amongst them. It is only if the name were first given by Gentiles outside the Church, or in some purely Gentile community, that a precedent would be sought in the pagan associations. But that would not at all account for the connexion between the bishop and the deacons.

Unfortunately we cannot go beyond hypotheses. In that obscure period with which we are dealing we can only make our way by means of guesses. A few verses in the Acts would have made matters much clearer for us; but those verses were not written, and we must do as well as we can without them. In default therefore of more direct verification, I can only leave the suggestion which I have made to the judgment of scholars, to say whether it does, or does not, fit the facts.[1]

II. I am not sure that there is not some confirmation of this view to be found in the question with which we have next to deal. It seems to me to be an objection especially to Dr. Harnack's development of Dr. Hatch's theory, that it involves too great a separation between the bishop and the presbyter. I admit that in the passages which Dr. Harnack has enumerated they may be regarded as separable; but there are others in which that is not the case. In Acts xx. 17, St. Paul is described as summoning the *presbyters*

[1] The above argument seems to me to be greatly strengthened by the fact that before the end of the first century a direct appeal is made to the Old Testament in support of the Christian institution. Clement of Rome (*ad Cor.* c. 42), quotes from Isa. lx. 17 with a freedom which allows him to introduce the combination of ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι: he is very explicit: καὶ τοῦτο, οὐ καινῶς; ἐκ γὰρ δὴ πολλῶν χρόνων ἐγέγραπτο περὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ διακόνων, οὕτως γάρ που λέγει ἡ γραφή· Καταστήσω τοὺς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει (LXX δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ). The same passage is quoted with a similar object but without variation from the LXX., by Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 26, 5.

from Miletus, and yet in his address to them he says, that the Holy Ghost has made them "bishops" (or *overseers*) "in the flock" (Acts xx. 28). In 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, which might be quoted to the same effect, ἐπισκοποῦντες is omitted by B ℵ, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, and appears to be doubtful, though it is found in all the versions, and so is probably a second century reading. But Tit. i. 5–7 seems to be quite unequivocal. "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest . . . appoint *elders* (presbyters) in every city . . ., *for a bishop* (overseer) must be blameless," etc. Clearly the clause which assigns the reason, relates to the same persons as the previous clause, and those who are called in the one place "presbyters" are called in the other "bishops."

It is a cheap way of escaping the force of these passages to ascribe a late date to the documents from which they are taken. I do not feel myself at liberty to do this: I believe, not merely on traditional, but on what I conceive to be critical grounds, that the Acts were written by St. Luke *circa* A.D. 80, and the Epistle to Titus either by St. Paul, or by a companion writing for him, in the year 66 or 67. But even if the latest possible date were assigned to both books, the difficulty might be somewhat lessened, but it would be a long way from being removed. By the time of Ignatius the bishop has emerged, or is emerging, from the presbyterate. Before Ignatius there was certainly a broad *stratum* of literature—including, if not the Epistle to the Philippians, the Pastoral Epistles, the Acts, and probably the Epistle of Clement of Rome—in which bishop and presbyter were regarded as identical at least to the extent that both names were given to the same persons, and that the one suggested the other. How can we account for this if their origin was so wide apart as is supposed? On the theory of Dr. Harnack the interval between them is at its widest.[1] With

[1] We must not hold Dr. Harnack too closely to his words: but he himself,

the modification which I have proposed, it would be much narrower. In accordance with this, both titles, "bishop" and "presbyter," would take their rise on Jewish ground, and under very similar conditions. It would be implied in the very nature of the case that every bishop was a "presbyter," or elder, at least in the wider sense: for the object of his appointment would be to temper the zeal and energy of the younger deacons with something of the wisdom and experience of age. And it is probable that the bishop would be also a presbyter in the narrower sense in which that term is applied not to the whole body of "seniors" in the community but to the smaller committee of that body, to which was entrusted the management of its affairs. One who possessed the qualifications of a "bishop" could hardly fail to have a seat in this smaller body; so that the cases would be rare indeed in which the bishop might not be described indifferently as an elder or presbyter, though it would not necessarily follow that every presbyter was a bishop.

This seems to be as far as the data will carry us. In any case it must be wrong to press the identification too closely. For on the one hand the mere fact of a difference of name points to some difference of origin; and on the other hand, if bishop and presbyter had been absolutely identical, it seems impossible to understand how the bishop came to disengage himself again so quickly. It would rather seem that there was a loose use of words, and that ἐπίσκοπος, and still more ἐπισκοπεῖν, were sometimes employed in a strict and sometimes in a wider sense, precisely like πρεσβύτερος. If πρεσβύτερος sometimes means all those members of a community who have passed a certain age, and sometimes members of the executive committee chosen from among

at an earlier stage, had maintained the identity of presbyters and bishops, *e.g.* in his note on Clem. *ad Cor.* 42: "Luce clarius est, duo in clero ordines et apostolorum tempore et tum temporis fuisse, episcopos (=presbyteros) et diaconos."

them, it does not seem a forced assumption to suppose that ἐπίσκοπος might occasionally be used of any presbyter, though properly the ἐπίσκοπος is a presbyter with certain other functions superadded. This would be the more easy, as the committees do not seem to have been large. The *Apostolic Ordinances* (of which something was said in the last paper) set the number at four, one bishop and three presbyters. But Dr. Harnack has given good reasons for believing that the original document, reproduced in the *Ordinances*, had *two* presbyters instead of three. This document Dr. Harnack dates about 140–180 A.D. (*Texte u. Untersuch.*, Band II. Heft 5, pp. 11, 55).

III. If I have been obliged to express some dissent from Dr. Harnack on the first two points proposed for our consideration, I am glad to find myself in cordial agreement with him on the third. It seems to me, that with the *Didaché* before us, we are almost driven to the conclusion which he has grasped so firmly. It is the master-key which alone fits all the wards of the historical problem.

Until the discovery of the *Didaché* there were certain phenomena of the Apostolic age which hung as it were in the air. They were like threads cut off abruptly of which we saw the beginning, but neither middle nor end. It is just these phenomena that the *Didaché* takes up, brings them again to our sight, and connects them with the course of subsequent history.

What, it might have been asked, became of all those spiritual gifts of which we have so vivid a description in the First Epistle to the Corinthians? What are these mysterious figures of "apostle," "prophet," and "teacher," who flit here and there across the stage, but nowhere stay long enough to be interrogated? Clearly they were not the unsubstantial forms that they are apt to appear to us. They must have had some more or less definite functions:

but, except for the details in those precious chapters (1 Cor. xii., xiv.), we should have had little idea what those functions were.

The *Didaché* gives us a glimpse of the same figures—we can hardly think much more than a generation later than even the Epistles to the Corinthians; I incline, with most English critics, to place the date about 100 A.D., if not before. We see them moving about from Church to Church, highly honoured wherever they went; pledged to poverty, and taking away nothing with them from the Churches which they visit, but if they (or rather specially the prophet) choose to settle in any community, gladly supported by the first-fruits and gifts of the members; preaching the word; conducting the Sunday services, especially the Eucharist, where the prophet alone is not bound to follow any set form.

From another side another difficulty arose for the solution of which we must also go to the *Didaché*.

The Jewish presbyters do not appear to have had any spiritual functions. Their duties were rather disciplinary and judicial. The ἀρχισυνάγωγος had to provide for the service of the synagogue, to keep order during the service, and to determine who should be invited to read the lesson or deliver the address; but the ἀρχισυνάγωγος himself did not necessarily do either the one or the other.

In like manner, before the Ignatian Epistles there is only very slight evidence that either the Christian presbyter or bishop exercised what we should call spiritual functions. The evidence would be "the laying on of hands" by the presbytery upon Timothy when he first received the gift which St. Paul calls upon him to cherish (1 Tim. iv. 14), and the three allusions to the gift of teaching or preaching as a desirable qualification in a presbyter or bishop (1 Tim. iii. 2; v. 17; Tit. i. 9). In the first of these instances, the "laying on of hands" by the presbytery accompanies an

intervention, which is not more precisely defined, on the part not of the presbytery, but of the prophets or prophet (the phrase is *τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος, ὃ ἐδόθη σοι διὰ προφητείας μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*). In the others it does not follow that every bishop or presbyter would have the gift of teaching or preaching. Indeed, the second passage expressly excludes this: when it is said, "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially those who labour in the word and in teaching," it is clearly implied that there were elders who did not labour in the word and in teaching. But there is no hint, to the best of my belief, either throughout the New Testament, or in the works of the Apostolic Fathers prior to the *Didaché*, which connects bishops or presbyters with the conduct of the Christian services. There are, of course, repeated references to the Apostles as "breaking the bread" and offering public prayer; and there is one reference to other ministrations of the same kind (Acts xiii. 1, *λειτουργούντων τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ νηστευόντων*), but it is the "prophets and teachers" resident at Antioch to whom these ministrations are ascribed.

If it is asked then, by whom the Christian services were conducted, we may accept the indication in the last passage, and say without much hesitation, as a rule, and so far as our information goes, by the prophets and teachers. The *Didaché* confirms this. It makes it clear that, wherever he was present, the prophet took the lead in such services. He has indeed a special privilege in connexion with them, which he does not share with any one else. He alone is allowed the untrammelled use of *extempore* prayer. In other respects the teacher is put upon the same footing with him.

To these two, the prophet and the teacher, the ministry of the word and sacraments appears to have fallen in the first line; in the second line it fell to the bishops and deacons. They also are to have a place in the honour

conferred upon the prophets and teachers, because they discharge the same sacred duties (*ὑμῖν γὰρ λειτουργοῦσι καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων. Did.*, c. 15).

More than this we are left to fill up by speculation. But it is no hazardous speculation which leads us to see the advantage which the stationary and permanent officers of a Church must have possessed over those who were only occasional visitants, and whose visits moreover must have become less and less frequent as time went on. The high pitch of the Corinthian Church at the time when St. Paul wrote to it, could not always be sustained. There must come a time when the splendid dawn of Spirit-given illumination would "fade into the light of common day." Then the Churches would be thrown back on their more ordinary resources, and those who had hitherto been chiefly employed in dispensing alms, in organizing hospitality, in keeping the rolls of church-membership, in conducting the correspondence with foreign Churches, in representing the Church in its contact with the world, and in providing the material accessories of the Church services, would be called upon to devote themselves more regularly and permanently to a still higher function, the direct approach to God in worship and thanksgiving.

The *Didaché* marks the half-way stage on the road to what gradually became the normal condition of things. It was natural that there should be a reluctance in some quarters to confess that the dead level had been reached, and that the gift of extraordinary inspiration had been withdrawn. This reluctance expressed itself in Montanism, which was a protest against the assumption that "prophecy had ceased." The reviewer of Dr. Hatch's *Bampton Lectures*, in the *Church Quarterly* (Vol. xii. p. 438), says that "Montanism specially represents the spirit of innovation. They (the Montanists) claimed to inaugu-

rate a new era, the era of the Spirit." It is of course true that the Montanists claimed to inaugurate the era of the Spirit; but, that does not make them represent the "spirit of innovation." So far from being innovators, they really professed to perpetuate the prophetic gifts which had been handed down from the time of the Apostles, and which they saw dying out in the Catholic Churches all around them. Not content with asserting the continuance of these gifts, Montanus went a step further, and claimed to be himself a revelation of the Paraclete, *i.e.* not the end of a descent but the climax of an ascent from the day of Pentecost. It was this element of conservatism in it, the fact that it spoke the language and re-affirmed the ideas of a by-gone day, that gave Montanism its strength, and won over to it so powerful a champion as Tertullian. But the event showed that the movement, so far as it professed to rest upon prophecy, was a spurious one. Priscilla and Maximilla were not part of the foundation on which the Church was to be built. Montanism had its high aims and aspirations. Perhaps its best side was its assertion of the independence of the individual Christian against the growing powers of a mechanically-working hierarchy. But the follies with which it was mixed up weakened its cause; and the consequence of the whole movement was rather to accelerate, by force of reaction, the process which it sought to retard. The *ecclesia Spiritus* had to yield to the *ecclesia episcoporum*. It was necessary perhaps for the preservation of Christianity that it should do so. The centrifugal tendencies in the Church were so strong that if once they had got the upper hand the end might have been simply wreck and ruin. But good and evil are inextricably blended in this world. Something that was good perished, or at least was driven inwards, with the fall of Montanism. It broke out again—never more, we will hope, to be extinguished—at the Reformation.

Let me cast a glance backwards, and try to summarize, as well as I can, the position in which it seems to me that the question as to the origin of the Christian Ministry stands at the present time.

(1) As to the source from which was derived the name ἐπίσκοπος, we have not yet, I think, heard the last. I have ventured to put forward a suggestion myself, in regard to which I should be interested to know the opinion of others. It is possible that there may be more evidence in the background for Dr. Hatch's view than I have been able to recognise. I have no antecedent objection to this, and shall be quite willing to accept it if it can be established; but I do not think that it can be held to be established at present.

(2) I think that it is necessary to recognise more fully than Dr. Harnack has done, though not quite so unreservedly as is maintained by Dr. Lightfoot, the practical identity of bishop and presbyter in the latter half of the apostolic age. I seem to be able to explain well enough to my own satisfaction the places where a bishop is called "presbyter," but I can only account for those where a presbyter is called "bishop" by assuming a looseness or double use of language, which some may be slow to admit. On *a priori* grounds it seems easy to understand why the bishop should be president of the college of presbyters, but any direct evidence bearing upon this would be welcome. It would also be most welcome, if any such evidence could be produced, as to the part taken by the bishop in public worship at a date earlier than the *Didaché*. I am conscious of not having anything to offer myself but inference and conjecture, for which I am mainly indebted to my predecessors.

(3) At the same time, the general principle that there were two distinct forms of ministration in the primitive Church, the one local, the other not confined to any set

locality; the one by formal appointment, the other without such appointment, but claiming direct Divine attestation; the one more upon the ordinary level of human activity, the other extraordinary: and further that there was a gradual transference, especially of the functions relating to worship, from the second class to the first, which was in rapid progress by the end of the first century: this seems to me to have been triumphantly proved by the statements and silences of the New Testament, taken along with the few but eloquent sentences of the *Didaché*. The theory no doubt is a new one, and it will have to run the gauntlet of criticism. I myself am only giving a preliminary impression in regard to it; but it is an impression which I strongly suspect will be confirmed.

In tracing the growth of these primitive institutions, I have tried to be as far as possible constructive, and to present the facts in what I believe to be their genetic and organic sequence. This has led me to avoid controversial digressions, more particularly on lines which seem to me to lead nowhere. Among these irrelevant and inconclusive arguments I should include that which sees in Timothy and Titus the direct and lineal ancestor of our modern bishops. No doubt we must look not at names, but at things. Names are, however, the indications of things. And in the case of institutions, the only means we have of tracing continuity is by following the course of the name. Institutions are in this respect like persons. We are told that every particle of our bodies changes, if I am not mistaken, once in seven years. Yet personal identity survives, and is marked by the name. In like manner the name of an institution may change its contents; these may be added to, or subtracted from, or transformed in one way or another; but the process is a historical one, and the track of its history follows the course of its name. Now it is true that Timothy and Titus are

called "bishops," but in authorities so late as to be practically worthless. And on the other hand they are represented in the Epistles addressed to them, not as being bishops themselves, but as appointing other persons to be bishops. It is to those other persons that we must look to see what the attributes of a bishop were; and it is by comparing the different instances in which the name occurs that we must trace their development. The only other method that I could conceive to be legitimate would be arguing *à priori* from the known conditions of the case; and this twofold method is that which has been pursued above.

Another caution that should be borne in mind is, that in approaching the subject it is well to divest ourselves as far as possible of associations derived from the modern episcopate. The bishop of primitive times was not by any means the potentate that we are apt to think him. There were at first very few Christians in the country, and these few would come into the towns to worship. Every town of any size had its bishop; and if there were several churches, they were served by the clergy whom the bishop kept about him: they were in fact like our present "chapels of ease," and the whole position of the bishop was very similar to that of the incumbent of the parish church in one of our smaller towns. The tendency at first, as Ignatius shows, was towards complete centralization: the whole serving of his παροικία was directly in the hands of the bishop. The parish system in the later sense, with an extended diocese, and a number of more or less independent clergy circling round the bishop, did not grow up until the 6th–9th centuries, when it took shape mainly in France under the Merovingian and Carolingian kings.[1]

In some of these respects the Nonconformist communities of our own time furnish a closer parallel to the primitive

[1] See all this admirably drawn out in Dr. Hatch's 8th lecture.

state of things than an Established Church can possibly do. Christianity itself was an instance of Nonconformity. Accordingly it could not, either in theory or in practice, embrace every person in the state: the Christian Church consisted of a number of scattered congregations, islanded as it were amongst the masses of an alien population. At first the ubiquitous ministrations of apostles, prophets, and teachers, and afterwards the federation of bishops, formed the bond of union.

When first I began these articles it was my intention, when I got to the end, to review the position from a different standpoint, viz. in its bearing upon our confessional differences. But on second thoughts I think that it will be best at least to postpone that part of the subject for the present. We are too apt in England to let our thoughts run ahead of the argument and to be speculating anxiously about the end before we have well got beyond the beginning. So the whole of our mental vision is troubled and distorted; we do not look straight at the facts, but are always casting our eyes askance at their imagined consequences. It is time that we broke ourselves of this habit. And the best way to do so is to keep the two parts of our enquiry strictly separate. When the facts have once been ascertained, we can then turn round and consider how we stand in regard to them.

W. SANDAY.

THOUGHT IT NOT ROBBERY TO BE EQUAL WITH GOD.

No words of Holy Scripture are more full of mysterious significance than the assertion in Philippians ii. 6 that at His Incarnation "Christ Jesus . . . emptied Himself." And, than the words which introduce this mysterious assertion, *οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*, no words have presented to the expositor greater difficulty. Their difficulty, their importance as prefacing the greater words which follow them, and what seems to me to be a misinterpretation of them prevalent now in this country, suggest a careful investigation of their meaning.

For light upon the grammatical sense of a passage in one of St. Paul's shorter Epistles, we naturally turn first to Bishop Ellicott. He tells us that the word *ἁρπαγμός*, if we look simply at the usual significance of its termination, "would seem to denote 'the act of seizing;'" and quotes a passage from Plutarch (perhaps the only one outside Christian literature in which the word is found) in which it has indisputably this active sense. But the rendering adopted in the Authorized Version from the Latin Fathers and placed at the head of this paper, which gives to the word an active meaning, he rejects. And rightly so. For robbery implies injustice. And injustice is no part of the meaning of *ἁρπάζω* or of its derivatives. They denote simply violent seizure, grasping with a strong hand, whether the seizure be just or unjust. This is evident from the use of the word in the New Testament. So John vi. 15, "Seize Him, that they may make Him king;" Acts viii. 39, "the Spirit of the Lord snatched away Philip;" 2 Corinthians xii. 2, "caught up even to the third heaven:" also Acts xxiii. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Jude 23; Rev. xii. 5; these being a large majority of the passages in which the word is found in the New

Testament. Moreover, it is impossible to conceive the Son thinking about the justice or injustice of being equal to God. If He were not essentially equal to the Father, He could not become so by violent seizure. If He were so, it would be needless and inconceivable for Him to lay hold with a strong hand of that which was already His secure possession. This exposition, therefore, we may, with Dr. Ellicott and most modern scholars, confidently dismiss.

But, while rejecting this one exposition, Dr. Ellicott is unable to find any other giving to the word ἁρπαγμός the active sense which, as he admits, its termination naturally suggests. He therefore supposes it to be equivalent to ἅρπαγμα, a less uncommon word denoting an object seized, or to be seized, that object being in this case τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ. In this he is supported by Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers. But Chrysostom understands the word to mean something already seized; Dr. Ellicott takes it to mean something which might conceivably be seized. The authority of the Greek Fathers and the close connexion in thought between an action and its object make these meanings of the word possible. But we naturally ask why St. Paul rejected a not uncommon word ready to his hand and put into its place a very rare one. The simplest answer is that the more common word did not, and the uncommon word did, express the meaning he wished to convey. But the only difference between these words is in their endings, the one having an active, and the other a passive, significance. Why St. Paul, wishing to convey a passive sense, chose a rare word suggesting by its form an active sense, Dr. Ellicott does not attempt to explain. Certainly, an exposition which gives to the word ἁρπαγμός the meaning suggested by its form has so far a great advantage.

But Dr. Ellicott's exposition lies open to a far more serious objection. He not only fails to explain the termi-

nation of the word before us, but gives to the word itself, in its root idea, a meaning it never has. Of ἁρπάζω and its derivatives, the constant and well-known meaning is *to seize, to grasp with a strong hand.* This the Bishop admits by paraphrasing the sentence, "*He did not deem His equality to God a prize to be seized.*" But he adds, "in other words, He did not insist on His own eternal prerogatives." Are these phrases equivalent? To "insist on His own eternal prerogatives," is to hold fast, and refuse to let go, that which had been for ever His. "A prize to be seized" is something not yet in our grasp. This strange meaning given to a derivative of ἁρπάζω, Dr. Ellicott does not support by even one example. He quotes Eusebius, *Ch. History*, bk. viii. 12: τὸν θάνατον ἅρπαγμα θέμενοι. But these words refer to men who flung themselves from high roofs, and thus laid violent hands on death and made it their own. Death was not theirs until they took it by force. So Chrysostom: Ad Phil. hom. 6. 2: εἶπε γὰρ, ὅτι ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐχ ἥρπασε τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ· καὶ μὴν εἰ ἦν Θεὸς, πῶς εἶχεν ἁρπάσαι; . . . τίς γὰρ ἂν εἴποι, ὅτι ὁ δεῖνα ἄνθρωπος ὢν, οὐχ ἥρπασε τὸ εἶναι ἄνθρωπος; πῶς γὰρ ἄν τις ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἁρπάσειεν; Throughout his long homily on this verse it is quite evident that this scholarly Greek writer had no other conception of the meaning of the word, than forcible seizure of something not yet in our hand.

Again, if the Son did not look upon His equality with God as something to be held, we must suppose that He actually surrendered it, that He ceased to be equal with God. An exposition which implies this, we cannot accept unless it be demanded by the plain meaning of the words used. That the Son actually surrendered for a time, by a mysterious act of self-emptying, "the form of God," *i.e.* the outward manifestation of His inward and essential equality to God, we readily admit. And this is implied in

the words before us. But we cannot conceive Him ceasing even for a moment, even amid His deepest humiliation, to be still in very truth equal to the Father.

Once more. The presence in this connexion of a derivative of *ἁρπάζω*, which always suggests a strong hand, would, in Dr. Ellicott's exposition, suggest also another strong hand, threatening to take away that which the stronger hand of the Son held but surrendered. In other words, the exposition I am combating does not explain the presence here of the idea of force which is always conveyed by the word whose meaning we are discussing.

The combined force of these objections seems to me fatal to the exposition we are considering.

The exposition of Dr. Ellicott is strongly supported by Dr. Lightfoot. He tells us that "the more usual form of the word" *ἁρπαγμός* "is *ἅρπαγμα*" (a very loose assertion altogether destitute of proof); and that "with such words as *ἡγεῖσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, νομίζειν*, the word *ἅρπαγμα* is employed like *ἔρμαιον, εὕρημα* to denote 'a highly prized possession, an unexpected gain.'" He paraphrases the words before us, "*did not regard it as a prize*, a treasure to be clutched and retained at all hazards." Here we have the common fallacy of loose equivalents. Is the phrase, "a highly prized possession" equal to "an unexpected gain"? That which we have held all our life by inheritance from our fathers may be a highly prized possession: it cannot be an unexpected gain. The chief thought conveyed by the latter phrase is acquirement, a thought entirely absent from the former. Oversight of this difference vitiates Dr. Lightfoot's entire note. He goes on to say that "*ἅρπαγμα ἡγεῖσθαι* frequently signifies nothing more than to clutch greedily, prize highly, set store by, the idea of plunder or robbery having passed out of sight." The idea of plunder, as is seen in the above quotations from the New Testament, quotations which might be

supplemented by many others from many writers, never had any place in the strict significance of the word. But wherever it is used we find the sense of taking hold of something not yet in our grasp. This sense of violent seizure is conspicuous in most of the examples quoted by Dr. Lightfoot.

Dr. Ellicott does not claim for his exposition any support from early Christian writers, except that he says "so in effect Theodoret," whose words he quotes *οὐ μέγα τοῦτο ὑπέλαβε*. But Dr. Lightfoot, in a valuable detached note, after paraphrasing his own exposition, which is practically the same as that of Dr. Ellicott, says, "This is the common and indeed almost universal interpretation of the Greek Fathers." Strange to say, the exposition for which this unanimity is claimed is, so far as I know, utterly destitute of support from the Greek or Latin Fathers. Certainly, it has no support in the writers quoted. It is quite true that the Greek writers agree with Dr. Lightfoot in rejecting the exposition noted at the beginning of this paper as accepted generally by the Latin Fathers. But they by no means accept the exposition which he advocates. This is evident even from Dr. Lightfoot's own quotations. For the more part the writers quoted merely reproduce St. Paul's difficult words without trying to expound them. Theodoret, following Origen, as does Theodore of Mopsuestia, gives the short exposition quoted by Dr. Ellicott: but this exposition suits equally well both the interpretation given by the two bishops and that advocated in this paper. That *ἁρπαζω* and its derivatives denote a taking hold of something not yet in our hand, is clearly shown in the quotation from Isidore of Pelusium, who contrasts the action of Christ with that of a liberated slave who would refuse to do servile work, whereas a born son, whose freedom was not acquired, would readily do such work.

Chrysostom, who expounds this passage at great length, understands St. Paul to say that the Son did not look upon His equality with God as an acquired possession; and reads into his words the idea that if the Son of God had looked upon His Divine prerogatives as acquired He would have clung to them as liable to be lost, whereas, knowing that they were His inalienable possession, He did not fear to surrender for a time the full exercise of them: an exposition akin to that of Isidore of Pelusium. This exposition fails because, according to it, St. Paul's actual words convey so small a part of the sense he wished to convey, leaving so much to be mentally added. It is now almost universally abandoned.

The truth is that no early exposition of this difficult passage is satisfactory. We are therefore left to seek by independent study the sense intended by the Apostle. Our only resources are the grammatical meaning of his words and the line of thought of the Epistle.

Let us give to the word ἁρπαγμός the meaning which Dr. Ellicott tells us the word "would seem to denote if considered apart from the context," *i.e.* its plain grammatical meaning, viz. "the act of seizing." We shall thus retain, as we have seen, the root idea of the word and the ordinary meaning of its termination. And this exposition will explain St. Paul's use of the rare word ἁρπαγμος instead of the more common one ἅρπαγμα and the phrase found elsewhere, ἅρπαγμα ἡγεῖσθαι. If this simple interpretation be correct, τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ is not the object, but the subject, of the seizing; not the object grasped or to be grasped, but the hand which grasps.

It is no objection to this exposition that it assumes that a state, viz. "equality with God," might conceivably be deemed an activity, viz. a strong-handed grasping. For if a state is a basis and condition of activity, the two are coincident and in our thought identical. A good example

of this, and a close parallel to the passage before us, is 1 Timothy vi. 5, *νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν.* Here we have, as in Philippians ii. 6, the termination *-μος* noting an active sense; and an underlying verb denoting acquirement. The men in question thought that piety and making gain went together. Had Christ looked upon the Divine powers He possessed in virtue of His equality with God as a means of taking for Himself the good things of earth, to His thought equality with God and high-handed seizure would have been coincident, and might have been spoken of as identical. This interpretation is therefore grammatically admissible. It remains to be seen whether it accords with the Apostle's train of thought and argument.

In Philippians ii. 4 St. Paul warns his readers against selfishness. He bids them not to be looking after their own enrichment, but to be looking after the good of others. This exhortation he supports by an appeal to the supreme example of Christ. He bids them think in their hearts the thoughts which were also in the heart of Christ. But instead of pointing to actions of Christ on earth revealing the thought of the Eternal Son, the Apostle directs us to one thought of the pre-incarnate Son of which His whole life and thought on earth was an outflow. That he refers to the not yet incarnate Son, is proved by the words, "having become in the likeness of men," which describe evidently His entrance into human life. The title "Christ Jesus" used of the pre-incarnate Son reveals St. Paul's deep consciousness of the personal continuity and identity of the Son, pre-incarnate and incarnate; and was perhaps suggested by the fact that it was in His life on earth that the mind and thought of the pre-incarnate Son were manifested as a pattern to men.

The mind of Christ which St. Paul desires us to cherish, he sets before us by a direct negative statement of His thought touching Himself and by a positive statement of

a mysterious action of the Son upon Himself, an action revealing His inner thought. The Apostle opens the sacred drama by presenting to us the pre-existent Son "in the form of God." His mode of self-presentation was the Father's mode of self-presentation. Practically, the "form of God" is the glory (John xvii. 5) which the Son had with the Father before the world was. For the glory of God is the outshining of the splendour of His invisible essence. The phrase is evidently chosen for contrast to the "form of a servant," in which the Son presented Himself to men on earth.

Form of God implies equality with God; for form without corresponding underlying reality (cf. 2 Timothy iii. 5) is deception. And St. Paul tells us that Christ did not look upon this implied equality with God as a "grasping," *i.e.* He did not use His Divine powers as a strong hand with which to lay hold of good things for Himself. Instead of this, "He emptied Himself." These words describe an action upon Himself the exact opposite of grasping. Like the rapacious man, the Son used force. But it was upon HIMSELF. (Notice the emphatic position of ἑαυτόν.) At His incarnation, for a time, He laid aside, by a definite action upon Himself, the full exercise of His Divine powers and whatever was inconsistent with the "form of a servant" and with His assumption of the "likeness of men." The negative thought underlying this positive renunciation, viz. the Son's mode of viewing His Divine prerogatives, is set forth in the foregoing words, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο. The object of the implied ἁρπάζειν is apparently the good things of earth, which the Incarnate Son, had He been prompted by selfishness, might have seized for His own human enjoyment. This is not inconsistent, any more than as we have seen is the title Jesus Christ in verse 6, with our sure inference that St. Paul is describing here the thought of the pre-incarnate Son. For He is described as

contemplating His approaching life on earth, and is here held up as a pattern to men on earth in danger of looking upon their various powers as means of seizing for themselves good things within their reach. The Incarnate Son might have claimed and taken for Himself the wealth, luxury, power, and splendour of earth: instead of doing so, at His incarnation He laid aside in some sense the operation of the powers with which He might have made good His claim. St. Paul tells us that this actual renunciation arose from His mode of viewing His Divine prerogatives. They were not in His sight a means of strong-handed self-gratification. Thus the positive assertion in verse 7 explains the foregoing negative assertion. For the Son's act of self-emptying, which took place in time, was an outflow of His eternal thought touching Himself.

Our English language affords no good rendering of the word ἁρπαγμός. We cannot translate it *plundering*. For this implies injustice, which is no part of the connotation of the Greek word. Moreover, there would have been no injustice even if the Incarnate Son had seized the good things of earth. The English word *grasping* most nearly reproduces the Greek sense; but is somewhat vague. The phrase *high-handed self-enriching* is clumsy. But it makes conspicuous the idea of force which is always present in the word, and the selfishness which so often prompts forceful seizure and which is present in St. Paul's thought here. In default of a satisfactory rendering, we may perhaps prefer, as open to fewest objections, DEEMED NOT HIS BEING EQUAL TO GOD a means of GRASPING.

The use here of the word ἁρπαγμός is specially appropriate to St. Paul's thought. He is warning against selfishness. Now the spirit of selfishness is essentially grasping. The selfish man uses his power to take hold of the objects within his reach. In absolute antithesis to this spirit is the mind of Christ. But instead of pointing us simply to

His disposition as manifested in His life on earth, the Apostle leads us up to the great renunciation which underlay that life, and to the eternal thought of which this renunciation was the outflow. He thus places before us an Eternal and Infinite Example of unselfishness.

The exposition given above is that of Meyer, than whom, both in grammatical accuracy and exegetical tact, we have no greater modern commentator on Holy Scripture. It is adopted in the very suggestive commentary of Hofmann, who in an earlier work, the *Schriftbeweis*, advocated another view. It is also adopted by Cremer in the new edition of his *Biblical and Theological Dictionary of New Testament Greek*. This new and improved and much enlarged edition is a valuable addition to our apparatus of New Testament scholarship. Meyer's exposition is referred to for a moment both by Ellicott and by Lightfoot; but is dismissed without due consideration. It is passed over in complete silence by the Westminster revisers, who give without any alternative the exposition of the two bishops. The same exposition is adopted in the *Speaker's Commentary*.

The whole passage before us is full of profound significance. Christianity differs from all other religions in that it sets before us a perfect Example, an absolute standard of excellence for all men and all times. Likeness to Christ is an infallible measure of moral worth. This being so, it might be thought that we should have a full portrait of the Son of God as Man on earth. Yet, strange to say, if we deduct from the Gospels the miraculous works which none can even attempt to imitate, and words the like of which none ever spoke or will speak, how little, comparatively, remains of the human life of Christ! It is well that it is so. Had we more definite details, our imitation might have taken hold of these instead of the mind that was in Christ. We are directed rather to those Divine acts of the Son which seem to be farthest from our imitation; to His Incarnation,

as in the passage before us and in 2 Corinthians viii. 9, a very close and compact parallel, and to His death for the sins of the world, as in 1 Peter ii. 21, iv. 1. That we cannot in the least degree imitate directly these mysterious acts of the Eternal Son, increases their value as an example. For the impossibility of direct imitation concentrates our attention upon the inner thought of which these are the outward expression. This inner thought of Christ, we are bidden by the great Apostle, himself a wonderful example of the imitation he desires in us, to make our own. And this inner thought of Christ, breathed into our hearts by the living presence of the Spirit of Christ, will mould our entire thought, and will change and raise and glorify our entire life.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XXV.

SALUTATIONS FROM THE PRISONER'S FRIENDS.

"Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner saluteth you, and Mark, the cousin of Barnabas (touching whom ye received commandments; if he come unto you, receive him), and Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision: these only *are my* fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, men that have been a comfort unto me. Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ Jesus, saluteth you, always striving for you in his prayers, that ye may stand perfect and fully assured in all the will of God. For I bear him witness, that he hath much labour for you, and for them in Laodicea, and for them in Hierapolis. Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas salute you."—COL. iv. 10–14 (Rev. Ver.).

HERE are men of different races, unknown to each other by face, clasping hands across the seas, and feeling that the repulsions of nationality, language, conflicting interests, have disappeared in the unity of faith. These greetings are a most striking, because unconscious, testimony to the

reality and strength of the new bond that knit Christian souls together.

There are three sets of salutations here, sent from Rome to the little far-off Phrygian town in its secluded valley. The first is from three large-hearted Jewish Christians, whose greeting has a special meaning as coming from that wing of the Church which had least sympathy with Paul's work or converts. The second is from their townsman Epaphras; and the third is from two Gentiles like themselves, one well known as Paul's most faithful friend, one almost unknown, of whom Paul has nothing to say, and of whom nothing good can be said. All these may yield us matter for consideration. It is interesting to piece together what we know of the bearers of these shadowy names. It is profitable to regard them as exponents of certain tendencies and principles.

I. These three sympathetic Jewish Christians may stand as types of a progressive and non-ceremonial Christianity.

We need spend little time in outlining the figures of these three, for he in the centre is well known to every one, and his two supporters are little known to any one. Aristarchus was a Thessalonian (Acts xx. 4), and so perhaps one of Paul's early converts on his first journey to Europe. His purely Gentile name would not have led us to expect him to be a Jew. But we have many similar instances in the New Testament, such, for instance, as the names of six of the seven deacons (Acts vii. 5), which show that the Jews of "the dispersion," who resided in foreign countries, often bore no trace of their nationality in their names. He was with Paul in Ephesus at the time of the riot, and was one of the two whom the excited mob, in their zeal for trade and religion, dragged into the theatre, to the peril of their lives. We next find him, like Tychicus, a member of the deputation which joined Paul on his voyage to Jerusalem. Whatever was the case with the others, Aristarchus was in

Palestine with Paul, for we learn that he sailed with him thence (Acts xxvii. 2). Whether he kept company with Paul during all the journey we do not know. But more probably he went home to Thessalonica, and afterwards rejoined Paul at some point in his Roman captivity. At any rate here he is, standing by Paul, having drunk in his spirit, and enthusiastically devoted to him and his work.

He receives here a remarkable and honourable title, "my fellow-prisoner." I suppose that is to be taken literally, and that Aristarchus was, in some way, at the moment of writing, sharing Paul's imprisonment. Now it has been often noticed that, in the Epistle to Philemon, where almost all these names reappear, it is not Aristarchus, but Epaphras, who is honoured with this epithet; and that interchange has been explained by an ingenious supposition that Paul's friends took it in turn to keep him company, and were allowed to live with him, on condition of submitting to the same restrictions, military guardianship, and so on. There is no positive evidence in favour of this, but it is not improbable, and if accepted helps to give an interesting glimpse of the prison life, and of the loyal devotion which surrounded Paul.

Mark comes next. His story is well known—how twelve years before, he had joined the first missionary band from Antioch, of which his cousin Barnabas was the leader, and had done well enough as long as they were on known ground, in Barnabas' (and perhaps his own) native island of Cyprus, but had lost heart and run home to his mother as soon as they crossed into Asia Minor. He had long ago effaced the distrust of him which Paul naturally conceived on account of this collapse. How he has come to be with Paul at Rome is unknown. It has been conjectured that Barnabas was dead, and that so Mark was free to join the Apostle; but that is unsupported supposition. Apparently he is now purposing a journey to Asia Minor, in

the course of which, if he should come to Colossæ (which was doubtful, perhaps on account of its insignificance) Paul repeats his previous injunction, that they should give him a cordial welcome. Probably this commendation was given because the evil odour of his old fault might still hang about his name. The calculated emphasis of the exhortation, "receive him," seems to show that there was some reluctance to give him a hearty reception, and take him to their hearts. So we have an "undesigned coincidence." The tone of the injunction here is naturally explained by the story in the Acts.

So faithful a friend did he prove, that the lonely old man, fronting death, longed to have his affectionate tending once more; and his last word about him, "Take Mark, and bring him with thee, for he is profitable to me for *the ministry*," condones the early fault, and restores him to the office which, in a moment of selfish weakness, he had abandoned. So it is possible to efface a faultful past, and to acquire strength and fitness for work to which we are by nature most inapt and indisposed. Mark is an instance of early faults nobly atoned for, and a witness of the power of repentance and faith to overcome natural weakness. Many a ragged colt makes a noble horse.

The third man is utterly unknown—"Jesus, which is called Justus." How startling to come across that name, borne by this obscure Christian! How it helps us to feel the humble manhood of Christ, by showing us that many another Jewish boy bore the same name; common and undistinguished then, though too holy to be given to any since. His surname Justus may, perhaps like the same name given to James, the first bishop of the church in Jerusalem, hint his rigorous adherence to Judaism, and so may indicate that, like Paul himself, he came from the straitest sect of their religion, into the large liberty in which he now rejoiced.

He seems to have been of no importance in the Church, for his name is the only one in this context which does not reappear in Philemon, and we never hear of him again. A strange fate his! to be made immortal by three words—and because he wanted to send a loving message to the Church at Colossæ! Why, men have striven and schemed, and broken their hearts, and flung away their lives, to grasp the bubble of posthumous fame; and how easily this good "Jesus which is called Justus" has got it! He has his name written for ever on the world's memory, and he very likely never knew it, and does not know it, and was never a bit the better for it! What a satire on "the last infirmity of noble minds"!

These three men are united in this salutation because they are all three "of the circumcision;" that is to say, are Jews, and being so, have separated themselves from all the other Jewish Christians in Rome, and have flung themselves with ardour into Paul's missionary work among the Gentiles, and have been his fellow-workers for the advancement of the kingdom—aiding him, that is, in seeking to win willing subjects to the loving, kingly will of God. By this co-operation in the aim of his life, they have been a "comfort" to him. He uses a half medical term, which perhaps he had caught from the physician at his elbow, which we might perhaps parallel by saying they had been a "cordial" to him—like a refreshing draught to a weary man, or some whiff of pure air stealing into a close chamber and lifting the damp curls on some hot brow.

Now these three men, the only three Jewish Christians in Rome who had the least sympathy with Paul and his work, give us, in their isolation, a vivid illustration of the antagonism which he had to face from that portion of the early Church. The great question for the first generation of Christians was, not whether Gentiles might enter the Christian community, but whether they must do so by

circumcision, and pass through Judaism on their road to Christianity. The bulk of the Palestinian Jewish Christians naturally held that they must; while the bulk of Jewish Christians who had been born in other countries as naturally held that they need not. As the champion of this latter decision, Paul was worried and counter-worked and hindered all his life by the other party. They had no missionary zeal, or next to none, but they followed in his wake and made mischief wherever they could. If we can fancy some modern sect that sends out no missionaries of its own, but delights to come in where better men have forced a passage, and to upset their work by preaching its own crotchets, we get precisely the kind of thing which dogged Paul all his life.

There was evidently a considerable body of these men in Rome; good men no doubt in a fashion, believing in Jesus as the Messiah, but unable to comprehend that he had antiquated Moses, as the dawning day makes useless the light in a dark place. Even when he was a prisoner, their unrelenting antagonism pursued the Apostle. They preached Christ of "envy and strife." Not one of them lifted a finger to help him, or spoke a word to cheer him. With none of them to say, God bless him! he toiled on. Only these three were large-hearted enough to take their stand by his side, and by this greeting to clasp the hands of their Gentile brethren in Colossæ, and thereby to endorse the teaching of this letter as to the abrogation of Jewish rites.

It was a brave thing to do, and the exuberance of the eulogium shows how keenly Paul felt his countrymen's coldness, and how grateful he was to "the dauntless three." Only those who have lived in an atmosphere of misconstruction, surrounded by scowls and sneers, can understand what a cordial the clasp of a hand, or the word of sympathy is. They were like the old soldier that stood on the street of Worms, as Luther passed in to the Diet, and clapped him

on the shoulder, with "Little monk! little monk! you are about to make a nobler stand to-day than we in all our battles have ever done. If your cause is just, and you are sure of it, go forward in God's name, and fear nothing."

If we can do no more, we can give some one who is doing more a cup of cold water, by our sympathy and taking our place at his side, and *so* can be fellow-workers to the kingdom of God.

We note, too, that the best comfort Paul could have was help in his work. He did not go about the world whimpering for sympathy. He was much too strong a man for that. He wanted men to come down into the trench with him, and to shovel and wheel there till they had made in the wilderness some kind of a highway for the King. The true cordial for a true worker is that others get into the traces and pull by his side.

But we may further look at these men as representing for us progressive as opposed to reactionary, and spiritual as opposed to ceremonial Christianity. Jewish Christians looked backwards ; Paul and his three sympathisers looked forward. There was much excuse for the former. No wonder that they shrank from the idea that things divinely appointed could be laid aside. Now there is a broad distinction between the divine in Christianity and the divine in Judaism. For Jesus Christ is God's last word, and abides for ever. His divinity, His perfect sacrifice, His present life in glory for us, His life within us, these and their related truths are the perennial possession of the Church. To Him we must look back, and every generation till the end of time will have to look back, as the full and final expression of the wisdom and will and mercy of God. "Last of all He sent unto them His Son."

Then that being distinctly understood, we need not hesitate to recognise the transitory nature of much of the embodiment of the eternal truth concerning the eternal

Christ. To draw the line accurately between the permanent and the transient would be to anticipate history and read the future. But the clear recognition of the distinction between the Divine revelation and the vessels in which it is contained, between Christ and creeds, between Churches, forms of worship, formularies of faith on the one hand, and the everlasting word of God spoken to us once for all in His Son, and recorded in Scripture, on the other, is needful at all times, and especially at such times of sifting and unsettlement as the present. It will save some of us from an obstinate conservatism which might read its fate in the decline and disappearance of Jewish Christianity. It will save us equally from needless fears, as if the stars were going out, when it is only men-made lamps that are paling. Men's hearts often tremble for the ark of God, when the only things in peril are the cart that carries it, or the oxen that draw it. "We have received a kingdom that cannot be moved," because we have received a King eternal, and therefore may calmly see the removal of things that can be shaken, assured that the things which cannot be shaken will but the more conspicuously assert their permanence. The existing embodiments of God's truth are not the highest, and if Churches and forms crumble and disintegrate, their disappearance will not be the abolition of Christianity, but its progress. These Jewish Christians would have found all that they strove to keep, in higher form and more real reality, in Christ; and what seemed to them the destruction of Judaism was really its coronation with undying life.

II. Epaphras is for us the type of the highest service which love can render.

All our knowledge of Epaphras is contained in these brief notices in this Epistle. We learn from the first chapter that he had introduced the gospel to Colossæ, and perhaps also to Laodicea and Hierapolis. He was "one of you,"

a member of the Colossian community, and a resident in, possibly a native of, Colossæ. He had come to Rome, apparently to consult the Apostle about the views which threatened to disturb the Church. He had told him, too, of their love, not painting the picture too black, and gladly giving full prominence to any bits of brightness. It was his report which led to the writing of this letter.

Perhaps some of the Colossians were not over pleased with his having gone to speak with Paul, and having brought down this thunderbolt on their heads; and such a feeling may account for the warmth of Paul's praises of him as his "fellow-slave," and for the emphasis of his testimony on his behalf. However they might doubt, Epaphras' love for them was warm. It showed itself by continual fervent prayers that they might stand "perfect and fully persuaded in all the will of God," and by toil of body and mind for them. We can see the anxious Epaphras, far away from the Church of his solicitude, always loaded with the thought of their danger, and ever wrestling in prayer on their behalf.

So we may learn the noblest service which Christian love can do—prayer. There is a real power in Christian intercession. There are many difficulties and mysteries round that thought. The manner of the blessing is not revealed, but the fact that we help one another by prayer is plainly taught, and confirmed by many examples, from the day when God heard Abraham and delivered Lot, to the hour when the loving authoritative words were spoken, "Simon, Simon, I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." A spoonful of water sets a hydraulic press in motion, and brings into operation a force of tons weight; so a drop of prayer at the one end may move an influence at the other which is omnipotent. It is a service which all can render. Epaphras could not have written this letter, but he could pray. Love has no higher way of utterance than prayer.

A prayerless love may be very tender, and may speak murmured words of sweetest sound, but it lacks the deepest expression, and the noblest music of speech. We never help our dear ones so well as when we pray for them. Do we thus show and consecrate our family loves and our friendships?

We notice too the kind of prayer which love naturally presents. It is constant and earnest—"always striving," or as the word might be rendered, "agonizing." That word suggests first the familiar metaphor of the wrestling ground. True prayer is the intensest energy of the spirit pleading for blessing with a great striving of faithful desire. But a more solemn memory gathers round the word, for it can scarcely fail to recall the hour beneath the olives of Gethsemane, when the clear paschal moon shone down on the suppliant who, "being in an agony, prayed the more earnestly." And both Paul's word here, and the evangelist's there, carry us back to that mysterious scene by the brook Jabbok, where Jacob "wrestled" with "a man" until the breaking of the day, and prevailed. Such is prayer; the wrestle in the arena, the agony in Gethsemane, the solitary grapple with the "traveller unknown"; and such is the highest expression of Christian love.

Here, too, we learn what love asks for its beloved. Not perishable blessings, not the prizes of earth—fame, fortune, friends; but that "ye may stand perfect and fully assured in all the will of God." The first petition is for stedfastness. To stand has for opposites—to fall, or totter, or give ground; so the prayer is that they may not yield to temptation, or opposition, nor waver in their fixed faith, nor go down in the struggle; but keep erect, their feet planted on the rock, and holding their own against every foe. The prayer is also for their maturity of Christian character, that they may stand firm, because perfect, having attained that condition which Paul in this Epistle tells us is the aim of all

preaching and warning. As for ourselves, so for our dear ones, we are to be content with nothing short of entire conformity to the will of God. His merciful purpose for us all is to be the goal of our efforts for ourselves, and of our prayers for others. We are to widen our desires to coincide with His gift, and our prayers are to cover no narrower space than His promises enclose.

Epaphras' last desire for his friends, according to the true reading, is that they may be "fully assured" in all the will of God. There can be no higher blessing than that—to be quite sure of what God desires me to know and do and be—if the assurance comes from the clear light of His illumination, and not from hasty self-confidence in my own penetration. To be free from the misery of intellectual doubts and practical uncertainties, to walk in the sunshine—is the purest joy. And it is granted in needful measure to all who have silenced their own wills, that they may hear what God says: "If any man wills to do His will, he shall know."

Does our love speak in prayer? and do our prayers for our dear ones plead chiefly for such gifts? Both our love and our desires need purifying if this is to be their natural language. How can we offer such prayers for them if, at the bottom of our hearts, we had rather see them well off in the world than stedfast, matured and assured Christians? How can we expect an answer to such prayers if the whole current of our lives shows that neither for them nor for ourselves do we "seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness"?

III. The last salutation comes from a singularly contrasted couple—Luke and Demas, the types respectively of faithfulness and apostasy. These two unequally yoked together stand before us like the light and the dark figures that Ary Scheffer delights to paint, each bringing out the colouring of the other more vividly by contrast. They bear

the same relation to Paul which John, the beloved disciple, and Judas did to Paul's master.

As for Luke, his long and faithful companionship of the Apostle is too well known to need repetition here. His first appearance in the Acts nearly coincides with an attack of Paul's constitutional malady, which gives probability to the suggestion that one reason for Luke's close attendance on the Apostle was the state of his health. Thus the form and warmth of the reference here would be explained—"Luke the physician, the beloved." We trace Luke as sharing the perils of the winter voyage to Italy, making his presence known only by the modest "we" of the narrative. We find him here sharing the Roman captivity, and, in the second imprisonment, he was Paul's only companion. All others had been sent away, or had fled; but Luke could not be spared, and would not desert him, and no doubt was by his side till the end, which soon came.

As for Demas, we know no more about him except the melancholy record, "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world; and is departed unto Thessalonica." Perhaps he was a Thessalonian, and so went home. His love of the world then was his reason for abandoning Paul. Probably it was on the side of danger that the world tempted him. He was a coward, and preferred a whole skin to a clear conscience. In immediate connexion with the record of his desertion we read, "At my first answer, no man stood with me, but all men forsook me." As the same word is used, probably Demas may have been one of these timid friends, whose courage was not equal to standing by Paul when, to use his own metaphor, he thrust his head into the lion's mouth. Let us not be too hard on the constancy that warped in so fierce a flame. All that Paul charges him with is, that he was a faithless friend, and too fond of the present world. Perhaps his crime did not reach the darker hue. He may not have been an apostate Christ-

ian, though he was a faithless friend. Perhaps, if there were departure from Christ as well as from Paul, he came back again, like Peter, whose sins against love and friendship were greater than his—and, like Peter, found pardon and a welcome. Perhaps, away in Thessalonica, he repented him of his evil, and perhaps Paul and Demas met again before the throne, and there clasped inseparable hands. Let us not judge a man of whom we know so little, but take to ourselves the lesson of humility and self-distrust!

How strikingly these two contrasted characters bring out the possibility of men being exposed to the same influences and yet ending far away from each other! These two set out from the same point, and travelled side by side, subject to the same training, in contact with the magnetic personal attraction of Paul's strong nature, and at the end they are wide as the poles asunder. Starting from the same level, one line inclines ever so little upwards, the other imperceptibly downwards. Pursue them far enough, and there is room for the whole solar system with all its orbits in the space between them. So two children trained at one mother's knee, subjects of the same prayers, with the same sunshine of love and rain of good influences upon them both, may grow up, one to break a mother's heart and disgrace a father's home, and the other to walk in the ways of godliness and serve the God of his fathers. Circumstances are mighty; but the use we make of circumstances lies with ourselves. As we trim our sails and set our rudder, the same breeze will take us in opposite directions. We are the architects and builders of our own characters, and may so use the most unfavourable influences as to strengthen and wholesomely harden our natures thereby, and may so misuse the most favourable as only thereby to increase our blameworthiness for wasted opportunities.

We are reminded, too, from these two men who stand before us like a double star—one bright and one dark—that

no loftiness of Christian position, nor length of Christian profession is a guarantee against falling and apostasy. As we read in another book, for which the Church has to thank a prison cell—the place where so many of its precious possessions have been written—there is a backway to the pit from the gate of the Celestial City. Demas had stood high in the Church, had been admitted to the close intimacy of the Apostle, was evidently no raw novice, and yet the world could drag him back from so eminent a place in which he had long stood. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

The world that was too strong for Demas will be too strong for us if we front it in our own strength. It is ubiquitous, working on us everywhere and always, like the pressure of the atmosphere on our bodies. Its weight will crush us uuless we can climb to and dwell on the heights of communion with God, where pressure is diminished. It acted on Demas through his fears. It acts on us through our ambitions, affections and desires. So, seeing that miserable wreck of Christian constancy, and considering ourselves lest we also be tempted, let us not judge another, but look at home. There is more than enough there to make profound self-distrust our truest wisdom, and to teach us to pray, "Hold Thou me up, and I shall be safe."

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

THE OLDEST PETITION FOR THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

M. RENAN has called the Epistle to Philemon a *note*. It is indeed a letter in few words, but this very brevity only enhances the greatness of its contents.

There are other writings in the New Testament which might be described in the same way, as, for example, the second and third Epistles of John.

This group of short letters seems to have been regarded by the primitive Church as scarcely worthy of a place in the canon of sacred writings. Many Churches did not receive the second and third Epistles of John, and Jerome tells us that the Epistle to Philemon was rejected by many writers. From the absence of any approach to doctrinal teaching in this Epistle, they concluded that it was not by St. Paul, or that, if it was his, it did not belong to the canon, since it contained nothing by which the Church might be edified. This decision arose out of a narrow view of the canon, and the primitive Church, as a whole, did not ratify the verdict. Preserved at first as a precious relic in the family of Philemon, this apostolic document was subsequently placed among the archives of the Church at Colosse, in the house of one of its elders. We find the first mention of it, as forming part of the Pauline collection, in the writings of Marcion, son of the Bishop of Sinope in Pontus, who about the year 140 went to Rome from Asia Minor. Soon after this it finds a definite place in the Canon of Muratori, in the fragment found at Milan in the middle of the last century, which dates from about the year 170, and contains a list of the writings received and publicly read at that time in one of the Western Churches, either that of Italy, or more probably that of Africa.

We observe, moreover, that the Epistle to Philemon formed part of the Western canon, included in the old Latin translation, usually called *Itala*, and that in the Church most remote from this, the Church of Syria, it also found a place in the authorised translation of the Scriptures, the *Peshito*, in the latter part of the second century.

It is obvious then that the Church very early learned to appreciate the importance of this brief letter. It differs undoubtedly from the other writings of the Apostle, inasmuch as it refers to a purely personal and private matter. But this private matter came within the scope of the work which Christianity was to accomplish among men. And even if it had not been so, how full of interest for us must be the one opportunity supplied by this letter of studying the character of the Apostle Paul in this private relation which brings him into such close contact with our daily life.

We read in Col. iv. 7 that when the Apostle sent to Colosse the letter intended for the Church of that city, he entrusted it to one of his fellow-helpers named Tychicus, and that Tychicus was accompanied by another brother—Onesimus—whom Paul describes by the honourable terms, "faithful and beloved," and speaks of him as "one of us." It is impossible to doubt that this Onesimus is the subject of the Epistle to Philemon, and that it also was therefore sent to Colosse. If any doubt at all existed on this point, it would be set aside by the statement of Theodoret, a Syrian bishop of the fifth century, who says positively that "the house of Philemon at Colosse was still standing in his time."

In the city of Colosse, in the beautiful basin of the Lycus in Phrygia, there lived then at this time a rich citizen named Philemon. This man, as we gather from the Epistle, had been brought by Paul himself to the knowledge of Christ; and as Paul had never visited the Churches of the district in which Colosse was (Col. ii. 1), we must conclude that the rich Phrygian burgher had been converted by the Apostle at Ephesus during a visit which he paid to that capital. The wife of Philemon, we find from the second verse of the Epistle, was named Apphia, and as Paul mentions immediately afterwards in the same

verse the name of Archippus, it is highly probable that this third personage was no other than their son.

Chrysostom indeed speaks of Archippus as a friend of the house, and Theodoret supposes him to have been a Christian teacher receiving the hospitality of Philemon; but these suppositions are not so natural. To us it seems more probable that Archippus, as a young Christian and the son of Philemon, should have been entrusted (in the absence of Epaphras, who had gone to Rome to see Paul) with the care of the Church at Colosse, and that it was in order to make him feel the responsibility resting upon him, that in the Epistle to the Colossians Paul wrote these words: "Say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it."

The Greek and Roman names of this household show what a hold the authority of Rome and the culture of Greece had taken of the once barbarous nations of Asia Minor.

After saluting the three principal members of the family, Paul goes on to greet the Church gathered in the house. This does not mean simply the household of Philemon; the name *Church* does not allow of such a restricted signification. On the other hand, the distributive preposition *κατά* equally excludes the whole body of Christians at Colosse. It refers rather to that portion of the Church which was accustomed to meet in the house of Philemon.

But it may be asked, if Paul was writing to Philemon on a private matter, why should he have addressed his letter to the section of the Church of which Philemon's house was the centre? And out of this question arises another. Why should he have associated the name of Timothy with his own in such a letter?

It must be admitted that the case of Onesimus interested in some degree the whole of the little community that was wont to meet in the house of Philemon. They had

all heard of the wrongdoing and of the flight of his slave; and now that Onesimus had come back as a Christian, Paul wished to secure for him from them all the same brotherly welcome which he desired Philemon and his family to give him. Hence he wrote commending Onesimus to the confidence and love of them all. It was doubtless with the same end in view that he introduced the name of Timothy. Perhaps Timothy had himself visited Colosse. At any rate his recommendation would take away any semblance of favouritism or personal weakness on the part of Paul. That which Paul asked as the "prisoner of Jesus Christ," Timothy asked in the name of the Christian brotherhood ("Timothy our brother") which united him to the Church at Colosse and formed a plea for the kindly reception of the new brother. We hear nothing further, however, of Timothy in the letter, and Paul speaks throughout in the first person singular, because it was really his affection for and personal interest in Onesimus which made him write.

What was the wrongdoing which had caused Onesimus to run away? The Apostle refers to it in *v.* 18. The expressions used do not necessarily imply that the fugitive slave had committed a theft. They may be explained on the supposition that he had been guilty of culpable negligence which had brought serious loss on his master. However this may be, it was the fear of well-merited punishment which had caused Onesimus to run away. Where had he escaped to? and where had he met Paul? Many commentators think that it was at Cæsarea, in Palestine, where Paul was kept a prisoner from the summer of 59 to the autumn of 61. It is urged in favour of this opinion that Cæsarea was less distant from Colosse than Rome. But a fugitive slave does not seek to hide as near as possible to his master, and it was far easier to get from Ephesus to Rome than to Cæsarea. The runaway would obviously be much less likely to be found by

his master in the great capital of the world than in the little residence of Cæsarea. The other reasons urged in favour of Cæsarea are still more feeble and bordering on the absurd, as the reader may judge by reading those alleged by Meyer. We have already observed, in our paper on the Epistle to the Colossians, how much more natural it seems to date that Epistle from Rome than from Cæsarea, and this would suffice to decide the question with regard to Philemon. We find moreover in *v.* 22 what seems to me an irrefutable argument to show that that letter was written during the captivity in Rome, that is, between the spring of the years 62 and 64.

Let us now turn to the Epistle itself.

A modern commentator has shrewdly observed that the Epistle to Philemon was a practical commentary on the injunction of the Apostle in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 6): "Let your speech be always with grace seasoned with salt." As we study the letter in detail, we shall be struck with the truth of this remark.

In the opening words *v.* 1–3, the Apostle speaks of himself as the prisoner of Jesus Christ, delicately substituting this description for the usual one, "servant of Jesus Christ." He is indeed at this time fulfilling his apostolic calling, not by active missionary labours, but by bonds and imprisonment.[1] This thought is well adapted to open the heart of Philemon to grant the request Paul has to make. He calls Philemon his "beloved and fellow worker," because when he became a Christian, he had placed his strength, his property, and his life at the service of the same work in which Paul himself was engaged—the salvation of men (*v.* 6). In *v.* 2 he gives Archippus a somewhat different title. He calls him his "fellow soldier," because, as Epaphras' deputy, he had to contend at Colosse for the truth, and specially to combat the false doctrine which threatened to invade the Church.

[1] The expression is equivalent to "captive servant of Jesus Christ."

These opening words are followed, as usual in Paul's epistles, by thanksgiving for that which God has already wrought in the readers, followed by a prayer for the continuance and increase of the work (*v.* 4–7). In *v.* 5 the Apostle says: "hearing of thy love," and not as in the corresponding passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 15) "hearing of the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you." The conversion of the readers of the Epistle to the Ephesians was an *accomplished fact*, of which the Apostle had been assured once for all, while the love of Philemon was a present and constant disposition of mind, the ever new manifestations of which gladdened the heart of Paul. The Apostle adds, "and of the faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all the saints." It is not without advertence that Paul brings out in this instance alone, the faith which a Christian should have, not only towards the Lord, but also toward those who belong to Him. He had spoken of faith in an analogous sense in 1 Cor. xiii. 7. "Love covereth all things, believeth all things." In speaking of the faith which Philemon has not only in the Lord, but also in the work of grace which the Lord can perform in the heart of the vilest of men, Paul is certainly thinking of the welcome he is about to ask for him who was formerly the unfaithful slave; which welcome must depend entirely on the confidence felt by Philemon in the work of grace wrought in Onesimus. A succession of disappointing experiences often produces among Christians, particularly among those who are older, a religious scepticism which paralyses love and kills enthusiasm. The good there is in the saints must be always with their fellow Christians, a matter of faith. It was this faith toward all the saints which was about to be tested in the case of Philemon.

In thanking God for this gift bestowed on him, there is an implied exhortation that he should be faithful to it in

the case in question. In *v.* 6 Paul gives the substance of his prayers for his friend Philemon.

"*The fellowship of thy faith*," must refer to the beneficent communications of which his faith is the source.[1] These become more and more abundant and effectual by the knowledge of the beauty and holiness of the work which God performs in Christians,[2] *to the glory of Jesus Christ*, through whom it is done. In desiring for Philemon a growing knowledge of the work of God in his brethren, Paul certainly wishes to prepare him to recognise with gladness and confidence the, to him, almost incredible change wrought in Onesimus. We see how free Paul's style is from anything that is stereotyped. Every word has its peculiar fitness. The language of the Apostle is the ever fresh garb of a truth ever new.

After this preamble the Apostle passes to the subject of his letter, the commendation of Onesimus to his master. But before making his request, as he does in *v.* 17, he carefully prepares the way (*v.* 9–16).

In *v.* 8, 9, he reminds Philemon who it is who makes this claim on him; it is he who, as the apostle of Jesus Christ, might have all boldness to declare to Philemon the will of the Lord, and to enjoin him what was fitting to do under the circumstances. But he prefers to appeal to his heart, asking that of him as a proof of his love which he might have enjoined as a duty. His claims to the affection of Philemon are all comprised in that name *Paul*, which recalls to him so many memories, and in those two epistles which renders its appeal still more forcible, "the aged," and "a prisoner." Paul's age at this time would be about fifty-five. His conversion took place in the year 36 or 37, and he could not have been then less than thirty years old. Had he been younger than this he would not have been

[1] The active sense of the word κοινωνία is proved by Rom. xv. 26.

[2] The reading "*in us*" is certainly to be preferred to "*in you*."

competent to receive from the Sanhedrim the important commission entrusted to him. But the labours, the sufferings, the perscutions he had endured, had prematurely aged him, and he knew well how these two words, "aged" and "a prisoner," would touch the heart of Philemon.

After thus reminding Philemon who it is that asks, he goes on to speak of the one for whom he intercedes. He is careful not to name him at first, knowing what painful associations the name would call up. He begins by describing the close bond which his conversion had formed between himself as the spiritual father and this child whom he had begotten in his bonds. And only after this does he mention him by his name Onesimus, which means "helpful," and which would be merely ironical if applied to the part played by him in the house of Philemon, but which has become now a true description, because of the kindly offices he has already done for Paul, and is anxious now to do for Philemon also if he will consent to forgive and receive him back. Paul is evidently playing here upon the name of the slave, but not as a mere *jeu de mots* to display his wit; rather as a delicate way of recommending the faithful slave to his master, by substituting for the remembrance of his past failures the hope of the services he might now render. It is in this capacity of a servant who will prove himself in the future worthy of his name (helpful) that Paul sends him back.

The same idea—"profitable to thee and to me" (*v.* 11)—is worked out in the succeeding verses. Only we must rectify the unfortunate modification introduced by the copyists in *v.* 12—"thou therefore receive him that is mine own bowels," which is an anticipation of the request in *v.* 17. According to the best manuscripts, *v.* 12 ought to read simply, "whom I have sent back to thee in his own person, that is, my very heart (or mine own bowels)." This expression is very common in Latin (*mea viscera, cor*

meum), meaning that which fills my heart. The sense is: "He is one with me in such a way that whatever you do to gladden him, my bowels will feel it as if done to myself."

Ver. 13, 14 enlarge on this idea of the value of Onesimus to Paul himself. He would fain have kept him in Rome, as an evangelist, all the more that his captivity rendered such help very needful to him. But he had refrained, not wishing to anticipate that which Philemon might feel prompted to do of his own accord, in granting the Apostle this welcome help. Paul does not wish to take Onesimus away from Philemon. If he is privileged to have his help, it shall be as a living proof of Philemon's affection for himself.

In *v.* 13 the Apostle says "that in thy behalf (*ὑπὲρ σοῦ*) he might minister unto me." This explains *v.* 15, 16, in which Paul enlarges on what Onesimus is to become to Philemon himself. Providence had perhaps permitted all that had happened in order that the temporary relation of master and slave, in which Philemon and Onesimus had stood to each other, might be exchanged for the eternal relationship of brothers in the Lord. Not that Philemon must on that account necessarily keep Onesimus with him; on the contrary, Paul has just hinted (*v.* 13, 14) at his hope that Philemon might perhaps spare Onesimus to him. But in this way the master would really benefit by the service of his slave; for the services which Onesimus would render to Paul in his Roman prison would be the very same kind offices which Philemon himself would gladly do him if he could. This is the explanation of the words, "on thy behalf," in *v.* 13. In *v.* 16, Paul says, "a brother beloved specially to me, but how much more to thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord." These words show how little even slavery excluded the gentler domestic affections. Onesimus is henceforward beloved by Paul as by no one else ("specially to me") unless it be by Philemon, in whom the

old affection of the master will now be reinforced by the new affection of the brother in Christ ("both in the flesh and in the Lord"). Before leaving this passage, which is one of inimitable grace and delicacy, we may call attention to the word "*perhaps*" at the beginning of *v.* 15. The Apostle is going to try and show the good results of the parting "for a season" of Onesimus from his master. But it is always very difficult to interpret the ways of Providence, especially when man's own misdoing has to be taken into the category of causes working for good. Therefore, feeling that it might be rather startling to Philemon to represent Onesimus' offence in this light, Paul discreetly adds "*perhaps*." God might no doubt have brought about the conversion of Onesimus by some other means; but as a matter of fact He had condescended thus to overrule evil for good.

After these preliminaries, each one of which has its due weight in the balance, the Apostle at length comes (*v.* 17–21) to the request he wants to make. He has reminded Philemon who it is that asks—Paul the aged and a prisoner; he has said who it is for whom he pleads—his own son in the faith, and henceforth a brother to Philemon, one capable of doing immense service to the Apostle in the great work laid upon him and which is dearer than aught else to the heart of Philemon also. He thus comes in *v.* 17 to the request which is the keynote of this short epistle. "If then thou countest me a partner, receive him as myself." Let us imagine Paul arriving at Colosse and knocking at Philemon's door. What rejoicings there would be through the whole household, alike in master and slaves! What delight in all hearts, on all faces! Just such a welcome he now asks for the wandering sheep that has come back to the fold. His request is not only for pardon and complete restoration, but also for the welcome of a brother in the household of faith.

There remains however one dark spot on the picture. Onesimus had caused considerable loss to Philemon, either by his own dishonesty or by the results of his negligence. In any case the loss had not been made good. Here then Paul offers himself as security for the reparation which is still due. "If he hath wronged thee at all, or oweth thee aught, put that to mine account." This offer might scarcely appear serious. In order that his reader may see that it is so, Paul repeats emphatically, "I, Paul, have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it."

Some interpreters have supposed that Paul wrote only this passage of the letter with his own hand. This seems to me a strained and childish explanation. He meant to call attention to the fact that, the whole letter being written by himself, the offer contained in these last words was well guaranteed: "I will repay it: *I* (ἐγώ), Paul, have written it with mine own hand." The past tense, "*I have written*," is a common form in Greek, by which the writer places himself by the side of the reader when the communication is received.

Bonâ fide as the offer is, it is clear that the Apostle thinks it impossible that Philemon will accept it; therefore he adds: "that I say not unto thee how that thou owest to me even thine own self besides"; which evidently implies that beyond the remission of this debt, Philemon owes himself, all that he is and all that he has, to St. Paul, inasmuch as he owes to him his eternal salvation.

In contrast to such unworthy conduct on the part of Philemon as demanding the payment of this debt by Paul, (who has, even in that case, taken the burden upon his own shoulders and released Onesimus), the Apostle goes on to describe in loving words what he really expects from his old convert: "Yea, brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord; refresh my heart in Christ." It is in Christ that he pleads; in Christ that he hopes to gain a hearing;

and this granting of his request will remove any uneasiness he might have felt for his dear son Onesimus. He hopes for even more than the obedience to which he feels he has a just claim. He is confident that Philemon will do beyond what he asks. Are not these words sufficiently clear? How can they have been misconstrued by so many commentators? De Wette, who sees the idea of the enfranchisement of Onesimus already expressed in *v.* 16 (*ὑπὲρ δοῦλον*), thinks that here something more is asked, some further benefit to be granted to Onesimus with his liberty. Meyer and Wiesinger, who refuse to see even here a request for the emancipation of Onesimus, also regard these words as indicating some special benefaction to be added to the pardon granted him.

We can but hope that Philemon read the thought of Paul more truly than these interpreters. Paul had clearly asked him to give up Onesimus to him for the work of an evangelist. Now it is perfectly plain that such a gift must imply the liberation of Onesimus, and that this is what Paul means by the words, "knowing that thou wilt do even beyond what I say." The Apostle has been accused of sanctioning the institution of slavery by restoring to his master a slave who had escaped from the yoke. On the contrary, the way in which Paul sends him back, reminding his master that it is not a slave, but one better than a slave, a brother beloved who returns to him, contains the moral premisses from which must follow, not only the immediate emancipation of that one slave, but the ultimate abrogation of slavery itself.

We have seen that the Epistles of Paul usually conclude with some personal references, greetings and commissions to the various brethren. It is so in this Epistle. There is something very touching in the request to Philemon in *v.* 22. Paul has just been asking him to receive Onesimus as himself; now he adds, as though with a smile,

"Withal prepare me also a lodging; for I hope that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you." If there remained any doubt about this letter being written from Rome, these words would be conclusive. When Paul was imprisoned at Cæsarea, he had just taken leave, and as he believed for ever, of the Churches in Asia Minor (Acts xx. 22), and all his thoughts were turned towards Rome. How could he at that time have been cherishing the hope of again visiting Colosse? In order to do so, he would have had to cross by sea from Cæsarea to Ephesus, and travel thence inland to Colosse; or to traverse the whole of Asia Minor, passing through Phrygia. We know that nothing was farther from the Apostle's thoughts than such a journey. But the case was altogether different when, after his captivity in Cæsarea, he had already passed one or two years in Rome. Circumstances had materially changed in the East, and particularly in Asia Minor. Colosse itself was in danger through the introduction of false doctrine. The evil had come of which he had forewarned the Ephesian elders (Acts xx. 29). "I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock." Before starting for Spain, the extreme limit of the then known world, and so cutting himself off finally from his old field of labour, the Apostle had a longing to go once more to the East to consolidate his work there. He expresses the same desire in writing from Rome to the Church at Philippi (Phil. ii. 24). "I trust in the Lord that I myself also shall come shortly." It may be said that the Apostle thus himself contradicts his farewell words to the elders of Ephesus (Acts xx. 25). "Now behold I know that ye all among whom I went about preaching the kingdom, shall see my face no more." But in any case the contradiction remains between these words and the passage in Philippians which we have just quoted, a passage which, as all critics agree, must have

been written from Rome. At the time when the Apostle took leave of the elders of Asia, he was leaving for the West, to fulfil a mission which, as far as he could judge, would absorb all the rest of his life, and it was very natural that he should look upon his farewell as final. And even if this presentiment had not proved true, there would have been nothing contrary to apostolic inspiration, rightly understood; for that inspiration only extended to the great facts of salvation. (See the Pastoral Epistles.)

The salutations contained in *v.* 23, 24 are the same as those in the Epistle to the Colossians, with the exception of those addressed to the Church at Colosse generally and to neighbouring Churches. These would have been inappropriate in a private letter.

After this detailed study of this short Epistle, which is at once so simple and so *naïf*, so full of heart and fine of wit; so appropriate to the particular circumstances, and, with all its playfulness so earnest, we find it difficult to understand how any critic could ever have been found to call in question its genuineness. This has been done, however, by Ferdinand Baur, who, to use his own expression, discerns in this Epistle "the embryo of a Christian novel, in which the author proposed to illustrate by a short narrative this great idea: that that which is lost in this world and for time, is found again in Christianity for all eternity. It was in order to work out the idea that the Gospel united for ever those who have been severed for a time by outward circumstances, that the unknown author conceived this fiction of the relation between Onesimus, Paul, and Philemon." Only a theologian very much preoccupied with erudite ideas, could have come to regard the simple fact which forms the basis of the Epistle to Philemon as only the fictitious illustration of a theory; or rather the author must have been very much driven into a corner by the consequences of his own system before he could

have invented such a way of escape. Baur was forced by his own theory of primitive Christianity to deny the authenticity of the Epistle to the Colossians, because the Christology of that Epistle was inconsistent with the limitations which he had laid down for the Apostle Paul, and approached too nearly the theology of the Apostle John. Now the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon are so closely linked together that it would be impossible to accept the one and reject the other. Hence Baur was compelled to sacrifice this innocent little Epistle, and to perpetrate a sort of critical murder.

We are now in a position to estimate the full importance of this short Scripture, and to pay our tribute to the wisdom of those who were not afraid to give it a place in the canon of the New Testament. It brings out two points of inestimable value and interest. First: It shows us what St. Paul was in little things. We know what he was in the treatment of great principles, and in carrying out the main work of his life, his mission to the Gentiles. But there are many great philanthropists who have undertaken to reform the world, and yet in their private life have shown themselves the proudest, most hard and self-seeking of men. In theory they have been full of the love of humanity; in fact, full of self-love. The Divine charity which the love of God had enkindled in the heart of Paul showed itself in little unnoticed things no less than in the great overt acts of his public life. We see him in this letter concerned (and with what tender solicitude!) for the reception which a poor guilty slave would meet with from his master. He writes in his behalf a letter as carefully considered, both in form and substance, as those which he addressed to the Churches of Rome and of Corinth. He throws as much heart into it as if the gravest interests of his apostleship were involved. And in order to show the importance he attached to it, instead

of dictating it, as was his custom, he writes it with his own hand. Such is the difference between true Christian love and that of mere humanitarian reformers.

This Epistle brings out secondly the marked difference between the Gospel method of action and the way in which men set to work to accomplish social revolutions. It was not by calling on the unhappy slaves to rise in armed rebellion against their masters that the Gospel struck off their fetters. It rather melted them by the fervour of Christian love, and so penetrated society with the principles of the Gospel that emancipation became a necessity.

The Epistle to Philemon was the first indication of the tendency in this direction, and may therefore be fairly called the first petition in favour of the abolition of slavery. In this respect Wilberforce was but a follower of St. Paul.

F. GODET.

RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM.—By the diligence of Bp. Wordsworth, Prof. Sanday, and Mr. White, we are put in possession of another volume of *Old Latin Biblical Texts*;[1] and had the summer months yielded only this, they might still be pronounced abundantly fruitful. Much of the labour which has been expended to fill these 400 pages is of a kind which need never be repeated, and which will save the time and eyes and brain of future critics. The Bobbio MS., containing portions of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew, is the oldest existing representative of the African version, and therefore stands in the front rank of Latin texts. It probably belongs to the 5th cent., and, if credit is to be given to an inscription it still bears, it is the identical

[1] *Old Latin Biblical Texts, No. II. Portions of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew from the Bobbio MS. (k), together with other fragments usually cited as n, o, p, a_2, s, and t.* By John Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury, W. Sanday, M.A., D.D., and H. White, M.A. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886.)

MS. which Columbanus, the illustrious founder of the monastery of Bobbio, carried with him in his wanderings. Necessarily its importance has been recognised; indeed it has already been twice printed, inaccurately by Fleck in 1837, inconveniently by Tischendorf in 1847–9. Bp. Wordsworth has made a fresh collation of the MS. with Tischendorf's text, and has been able to introduce some minute corrections, while cordially testifying to the accuracy of that indefatigable editor. To those who are making a thorough-going study of Textual Criticism it is a priceless advantage to have this version in so beautiful and convenient a form, and illuminated by criticism so intelligent and so cautious as the present volume affords. The fragments from the library of St. Gall had been transcribed by Tischendorf, but not all printed, and they have now been collated for this volume by Mr. White. Three small fragments from the libraries of Coire, Milan, and Berne are also here reprinted. The value of the volume is greatly enhanced by Prof. Sanday's laborious discussion of the relation of the Bobbio text to that of other Old Latin MSS., in which essay, says Bp. Wordsworth, together with his paper in the *Studia Biblica*, "we have the first-fruits of a detailed study of the history of these versions, from which great light may be expected." All this expenditure of fine scholarship and enormous labour is of course intended to contribute to the solution of the great question, What was the original Greek text of the New Testament. Prof. Sanday's researches have, however, taught him caution, and he will not as yet affirm what Greek text is implied in the Bobbio MS. But he has made a collection of data which must materially aid in the ultimate determination of the text; and, meanwhile, the patient researches of these scholars have brought to light much that will interest students of palæography, of literature, and of the New Testament.

Dr. Weymouth has published a Greek Testament which embodies a large amount of critical information in a convenient form. He prints in the body of the page his "resultant" text, that is to say, the text in which the majority of modern editors agree, "relegating to the footnotes readings less numerously or less weightily sanctioned." The reader has accordingly no means of seeing what reading is supported by the best MSS., but only of seeing what reading has the support of those who have most carefully examined these MSS. And although there is a satis-

faction in determining the text for ourselves, yet, after all, the ordinary reader is probably quite as safe in the guidance of "the majority of critics." Some may prefer the English Bible of Professors Cheyne and Driver and their coadjutors, as it gives at the foot of the page not only the editors who support this or that reading, but also the MSS. But Dr. Weymouth's Greek Testament occupies a place of its own, and will certainly prove most convenient for all who wish to see the nett result of modern textual criticism and desire a practically valuable text.[1]

Readers of the *American Journal of Philology* have recently become aware of the advent of a scholar who may be expected to do valuable work in Textual Criticism. To that journal Mr. Rendel Harris, Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, and now Professor of Biblical Languages in Haverford Coll., Pa., has from time to time contributed papers which prove him to be possessed of something more than aptitude for such studies. Through the kindness of the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, he is now enabled to publish in the perfect form which characterises all that issues from that press, the readings of a number of passages from Philo which he has culled from a Paris MS. This manuscript seems to have been used by Tischendorf for his eighth edition, under the impression that it was the Codex Rupefucaldi (Rochefoucauld), which is now in Mr. Fenwick's library at Cheltenham, where it may be consulted on payment of £1 per diem. The manuscript collated by Mr. Harris is in the *Galerie Mazarine*. It is written in uncials of the 9th cent., and is ornamented with interesting marginal pictures. It is one of those books of Sacred Parallels which seem to have abounded in the early centuries of the Middle Ages, and which are composed of extracts from the Old and New Testaments, from the Fathers, from Philo and Josephus, and even from the philosophers. They thus form a mine in which textual critics may find many readings of value for the correct editing of those ancient authors whose works are quoted. Mr. Harris has at this time confined his attention to an

[1] *The Resultant Greek Testament, exhibiting the Text in which the majority of modern editors are agreed, and containing all the readings of Stephens* (1550), *Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Lightfoot for the Epistles of St. Paul, Ellicott for the Epistles of St. Paul, Alford, Weiss for Matthew, The Bâle edition* (1880), *Westcott and Hort, and the Revision Committee.* By R. F. Weymouth, D. Lit., Fellow of University College, London. (Elliot Stock, *n.d.*)

author for whom he professes unbounded admiration, and, to use his own words, "has done many months' hewing of wood and drawing of water for the next editor of Philo," having selected from this old MS. all the passages of that author which are quoted in it. Such painstaking and devoted labour should find its reward.[1]

Introduction.—Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament* having already reached a second edition, he takes the opportunity of adding a chapter on the Non-canonical Books.[2] This chapter is also published separately for behoof of those who already possess the first edition of the lectures. It will be supposed that Dr. Salmon does not attempt to discuss all the apocryphal books of the early Church, and in making his selection he follows the guidance of Eusebius, and confines himself to the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistle of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. The Epistle of Barnabas belongs, he thinks, to the reign of Vespasian, and was not written by the Apostle Barnabas. The Epistle of Clement was written by a Jew about the year 96. Hermas was a younger contemporary of Clement. Influenced by the arguments and illustrations from the Talmud advanced by Dr. Taylor, Dr. Salmon concludes that the author of the Didache has taken a Jewish manual of instruction for proselytes, and has adapted it for Christian use by additions of his own. This hypothesis accounts for the relation between Barnabas and the Didache, neither borrowing from the other, but both from the same Jewish source; although, in Dr. Salmon's opinion, there is some evidence that the author of the Didache was acquainted with Barnabas. He differs from those who think it had a wide circulation and was of great importance, and believes that it "was a work of very limited circulation and influence, which spread but little and slowly outside the purely Jewish section of the Church." There is always great reasonableness in Dr. Salmon's criticism, and this lecture shows him at his best.

[1] *Fragments of Philo-Judæus newly edited by J. Rendel Harris, M.A., with two Facsimiles.* Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. (Cambridge, 1886.)

[2] *Non-Canonical Books. A Lecture supplementary to a Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament.* By George Salmon, D.D., F.R.S. (London: Murray, 1886.)

Exegesis.—To the Cambridge Greek Testament Series, Mr. Lias contributes a volume on the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*.[1] Former volumes of this series have taught us to expect very finished work. To say that Mr. Lias' volume does not maintain this high standard would convey a wrong impression; but his work is unequal, and together with much that evinces independent thought and research, there are several notes which disappoint, and a few which in our opinion are misleading. It would seem as if Mr. Lias had neglected some of the most accessible aids to the study of this Epistle; although it must at the same time be said that he has himself made a welcome and considerable addition to these aids.

The Dean of Peterborough gave proof of his editorial discrimination when he committed the *Epistle to the Ephesians*[2] to Principal Moule. Mr. Moule is that *rarissima avis* in our day, a thoroughly instructed theologian; and theology is as needful as scholarship for the exposition of St. Paul's Epistles. A stay-at-home geographer would have given us an edition of Marco Polo very different from Colonel Yule's; and the same practical acquaintance with the subject which marks out Mr. Tozer as the proper editor of Pausanias, fits Mr. Moule to edit St. Paul. His interpretations have that point and his inferences that catholicity of view which result from long familiarity with the subject, careful thought and wide reading. The more closely this unpretentious but closely packed little volume is examined the more thorough is the workmanship found to be. It is distinguished by a rational as opposed to a pedantic style of interpretation. (See especially p. 85.) But the rejection of the assaults on the authenticity of the Epistle is too summary. (On p. 71, for Appendix B, read Appendix C.)

Canon Tait in his *Charter of Christianity*[3] aims at supplying the

[1] *Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. The First Epistle to the Corinthians.* By Rev. J. Lias, Vicar of St. Edward, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press, 1886.)

[2] *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. The Epistle to the Ephesians.* By Rev. H. C. Moule, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall. (University Press, 1883.)

[3] *The Charter of Christianity: an Examination in the Light of Modern Criticism of our blessed Lord's Sermon on the Mount; and its Ethical Precepts compared with the best Moral Teaching of the Ancient World.* By Rev. Andrew Tait, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E., Canon of St. Mary's Cathedral, Tuam. (Hodder and Stoughton, 1886.)

want of a special commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. To this object he devotes a volume of more than six hundred pages, in which is gathered together from many sources material of various kinds for the ascertainment, elucidation, and practical enforcement of the text. The result is on the whole satisfactory. There is no very remarkable power or freshness in the volume, and it is scarcely thorough enough to win the attention of scientific critics; but industry, sense, and Christian warmth are everywhere discernible, and a highly respectable average of excellence is maintained throughout. A large amount of homiletical matter is introduced, and the preacher who is equipped with Tholuck's volume on the same subject and with this comprehensive work of Canon Tait may dispense with other aids. Usually adopting the text of Bp. Wordsworth, Canon Tait always gives his reason for doing so, and occasionally ventures to prefer some other reading. He does so in admitting the doxology to the Lord's Prayer; but his statement that "the doxology is found in all the Greek MSS. containing Matt. vi." is sure to mislead.

Miscellaneous.—The *prægustator* whose business it is to taste and see that poison is not administered to the public in the shape of literary dainties, is sometimes at a loss to analyse the composite flavour that first gratifies his palate and afterwards screws his face. The wholesome fare which Mr. Cunningham[1] serves up in very pretty garnishing is sadly spoiled by a mixture of deleterious stuff. And yet it is to be feared that the administration of the poison is quite as much his object as the furnishing of nutritious food. For is it not rather late in the day to be writing an introduction to the works of St. Augustine? Surely there already exist ample materials for the guidance of any serious student who wishes to instruct himself in Augustinian theology. And if Mr. Cunningham considered that the works of Nourrisson, or the Abbé Flottes should now be superseded, he must also have perceived that this could be accomplished only by a much more comprehensive book than he has given us. But it is continually suggested to the reader that the author's chief aim is to purge Augustinian and Anglican theology from all suspicion of Calvinism—a vain endeavour. It is notorious that the Church of England divines who framed the Articles were mostly Calvinists, and that the

[1] *S. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought.* By W. Cunningham, B.D., Trin. Coll., Cam. (Cambridge: University Press, 1886.)

authoritative expounder of the Articles, though himself an Arminian, allows that the seventeenth Article "does seem more plainly to favour" the Calvinists. The differences which Mr. Cunningham seeks to substantiate between the theology of Augustine and that of Calvin cannot be maintained, except in one instance, in which Augustine was obviously wrong. And if the Hulsean lecturer could so far master his antipathies as to consult the writings of his own namesake, the ablest modern defender of Calvinism, he would learn that it avails nothing to quote an *obiter dictum* which may be picked out here and there from the writings of Augustine and Calvin, and which may seem to indicate a different theology, but only to take the two systems as coherent organic wholes, and measure them one with the other. It is Canon Mozley's philosophical grasp, enabling him to exhibit the development of the Augustinian theology from one root, which gives permanent value to his great work, and makes its perusal the best of theological educations. With quite as wide reading, and perhaps a more complete knowledge of all that Augustine wrote, Mr. Cunningham has failed to give us a satisfying book, because he has not grasped Augustinianism as a whole. He has given us a book that is easily read, and that tells us much that is interesting about the great African bishop and his opinions; he has spared no pains in consulting somewhat obscure authorities, and he has gathered together much material for the history of Augustinian theology; but it would task even greater learning and ability than Mr. Cunningham's to prove Augustine an Arminian. It was an unlucky fate that led so industrious a writer to choose such a theme.

MARCUS DODS.

(To be concluded.)

THE PROPHET AMOS.

I. Jehovah, God of Israel.

There are many of opinion that the oldest written prophecy which we possess is that of the prophet Joel, which is assigned by those who consider it very early to the first quarter of the ninth century, in the beginning of the reign of Joash. The balance of modern opinion, however, inclines towards assigning a much later date to this prophet. The prophet Jonah lived and prophesied during the earlier part of the reign of Jeroboam II.; but beyond the prophecy referred to 2 Kings xiv. 25, which was fulfilled by the warlike operations of Jeroboam, nothing of his has come down to us, for our present Book of Jonah is not a prophecy, but an historical episode. Some scholars, indeed, assign to him the two chapters xv. and xvi. in the Book of Isaiah, but this is only a conjecture. Consequently the earliest prophetic writing of which we can speak with certainty is the Book of the prophet Amos.

The heading to the prophecies of Amos states that he prophesied "in the days of Uzziah king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel, two years before the earthquake." The chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah is confessedly obscure. Jeroboam probably did not outlive the middle of the eighth century, though some place his death in the first quarter of the century. Uzziah or Azariah is supposed to be mentioned in the Assyrian records as late as 740, though the reference is disputed. The precise date, "two years before the earthquake," suggests that the prophetic career of Amos in

northern Israel was of short duration, and that he fulfilled his course when Jeroboam and Uzziah were both upon the throne. The Book supplies evidence that he prophesied in the reign of Jeroboam (ch. vii. 10 *seq.*), and a later prophet (Zech. xiv. 5) informs us that the earthquake referred to occurred in the reign of Uzziah, though we have no means of fixing its date more exactly. The prophetic work of Amos may therefore be assigned to the first half of the eighth century, before 750.

Little is known of the prophet more than that he belonged to the district of Tekoa and was a shepherd. Tekoa, from whence the wise woman came whom Joab employed to turn the heart of David again towards his banished son (2 Sam. xiv.), was a place twelve miles south of Jerusalem, almost the farthest village in that direction, all beyond it running into pasture and dipping into the desert, so that the district was well adapted for flocks and the valleys for the cultivation of the sycamore fig. The place has been identified from ruins still remaining. Here Amos was one of the herdmen. The term *noked*, rendered herdman, is not conclusive as to the prophet's position. He might have borne such a name though the owner of flocks, for Mesha, king of Moab, is so called, 2 Kings iii. 4, though the word is there rendered "sheepmaster." Amos, however, further says of himself that the Lord took him from behind the flocks (ch. vii. 14), which seems to imply that he kept the flocks, though perhaps it does not exclude his being the owner of some of them. He adds that he was a cultivator of sycamore fruit, a kind of food said to be used by the poorer class of people. He was thus a man of the lower ranks of life, unlike the three great prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, all of whom belonged to the higher or to the priestly class, and his history illustrates the freedom of the grace that called to the prophetic office.

Of the manner of the prophet's life before his call to

prophesy, beyond what we can imagine from his occupation, we know nothing, nor of the causes, if any secondary causes there were, that induced him to cross the border and testify against the northern kingdom. Though a shepherd, he was learned in the things of God. He shows such familiarity with the history of his people that we are justified in inferring that some historical work was in his hands. He cannot, one would fancy, be a specimen of the men of whom his class in the kingdom of Judah was composed. It could hardly happen that such knowledge of history and such power to generalize upon the principles of God's government of the world and men as he everywhere shows could have been common among the herdmen of his day. And yet the Spirit of God does not usually teach mere facts capable of being otherwise learned. And we may infer from the example of this prophet that the nation's history was known in its great turning points even among the common people, and that even those whose occupation was the meanest, and whose life was passed farthest from the centres of religious influence and what we should call civilization, were able to rise to lofty thoughts of God and to generalize very broadly on His ways. The prophet's history indeed compels us to be more careful than is usual in regard to the inferences which we draw from his own language in his prophecies. Reading him, or indeed any of the prophets, we are ready to conclude that the prophet stood on one side and the nation *en masse* upon the other, that besides him there was none righteous, no not one. The idea suggested to us by the prophets of each successive age is the idea to which Elijah gave expression when he said, "I only am left alone." Yet we know how greatly he was mistaken, and it is certain that we must be on our guard against drawing too sweeping conclusions from similar language in other prophets. The prophet's function was that of a *corrector morum;* he was "full of power by

the Spirit of the Lord, to declare unto Jacob his transgression and to Israel his sin" (Mic. iii. 8), and it was the blots on the face of society and its perversities that attracted his eye. Those evils to which he applied his scourge undoubtedly existed; probably they were practised by the majority of the nation, but there was at all times a minority likeminded with the prophet, and how large the minority was cannot be inferred from his words, which are those of despondency or indignation. The existence of such a right-minded minority may be inferred, not only from the principle laid down by St. Paul, as applicable both to his own times and those of Elijah, that there was a "remnant according to the election of grace," but from many other circumstances. Too often no doubt the minority wanted courage, or they were scattered and unable to make their power felt against the ruling classes when opposed to them, or special circumstances prevented them from acting in the way to be expected from them. For example, the permission granted by Cyrus to the exiles to return home was not taken advantage of by nearly all who remained true to the religion of their fathers, for a second colony returned nearly a hundred years later under Nehemiah. Acting on the advice of Jeremiah in his letter to the exiles (ch. xxix.) they had probably formed connexions which could not easily be severed, and they might not feel assured that the Lord's set time to favour Zion was fully come. Men's actions are often not those which we should have expected from their position in history, because circumstances of which we are ignorant influenced their conduct. The great proof, however, of the presence of this right-minded minority in the nation at all times is just the fact of the existence of the prophets. We cannot account for the appearance of a succession of such men otherwise than on the supposition that they arose out of a society in the main likeminded with themselves and fitted to give them birth—

that they were the efflorescence, season after season, of a tree whose roots always stood in the soil. Something immediately extraordinary in the case of each individual prophet being fully admitted, something which is not to be quite explained by the operation of the mind upon truth already committed to it under the influences of Providence and life, still this operation is a thing on which the strongest emphasis must be laid. For this operation is but another name for religious life, and the history of Israel is a history of religious life, and not a history of successive external Divine interpositions merely which never succeeded in translating themselves into conditions of the human mind. Each prophet is the child of a past stretching back indefinitely behind him, and if so this past must have put forth its power in the forces and religious life of the society which gave the prophet birth. Several well known modern writers on prophecy, using as argument the strong language of the prophets just referred to, have concluded that such a prophet as Amos stood virtually alone in the nation; that there was a great gulf fixed, on one side of which stood the prophet and on the other the people in a mass, and that what the prophet did was nothing less than to enunciate and introduce a new religion, which had almost nothing in common with that hitherto professed by the people beyond the name Jehovah employed by both. This theory is not only opposed to all the representations of the prophets themselves and the universal tradition among the writers of Israel, but it entirely fails to account for the prophet. The old view, according to which each prophet was a simple isolated miracle, out of all connexion with the life and thought of his time, really offered an explanation, if the view could be accepted; and if the choice lay between the two theories, we should be driven to accept the old theory as necessary to the satisfaction of our understanding. The fact, however, that the prophet Amos himself arose out of

the lowest ranks of the people is sufficient evidence that there existed no such gulf between the prophets and the universal mass of the nation as the modern writers referred to represent.

Returning to the prophet, we find him familiar with the history of his people. From a single word, "his brother," we infer that he was acquainted with the story of Jacob and Esau (ch. i. 11). From another expression, "Moab shall die with tumult" (ch. ii. 2), we perceive that the prophecies of Balaam were familiar to him (Num. xxiv. 17). The prohibitions of the law are insisted upon when he is denouncing the sins of the people, such as retaining pledged garments over night: "They lay themselves down upon clothes laid to pledge by every altar" (ch. ii. 8)—in defiance of the law (Exod. xxii. 26). These laws were no doubt in his hands in a written form. He knows of the forty years' journeys in the wilderness and the traditions about the gigantic bulk of the Amorites (ch. ii. 10). He is acquainted with the history of David, and knows that he was a poet and musician (ch. vi. 5). Besides all this, he is familiar with the history of the nations around Israel, and even of those far off, such as Calneh, Kir, and Hamath (ch. vi. 2); his eye is attracted by the movements among the nations and their migrations from one land to another, on which he bases broad religious generalizations, seeing in them the directing hand of the God of Israel, "who brought the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir, and Israel from Egypt" (ch. ix. 7). Though the earliest of the canonical prophets, his view of the world is perhaps broader than that of any of them, just as his definitions of religion surpass in incisiveness and clearness those of the majority of his successors.

It is not quite easy to give any outline of the prophet's Book or sketch of its contents, because the same general ideas occur very frequently. These general ideas are in the

main: the injustice done to the poor of the people and the oppression of them by the great, in forgetfulness of the law of Jehovah and His goodness to them in bringing them up out of Egypt and destroying the nations before them, and in raising up prophets and spiritual guides among them; then threats of judgment and the downfall of the state because of these sins; then warnings against such hopes as they cherished regarding Jehovah's relation to them as His people, whom He could not cast off. Such hopes were vain: the anger of Jehovah could not be appeased by sacrifice and offering, nor was He one to be bribed by the fat of fed beasts. He sought righteousness. And their longing for His appearance at the day of the Lord was a delusive desire. He would appear, but for their destruction, not their salvation: "Wherefore will ye have the day of the Lord? the day of the Lord is darkness, and not light; as if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him" (ch. v. 18). Jehovah was their God, but this was no mere national relation; as a nation they were no more to Him than other nations: "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto Me, O house of Israel?" (ch. ix. 7;) only as a righteous nation could He be their God, and it was not their need of deliverance but their sins that would draw Him forth from His place to chastise them: "Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel" (ch. iv. 12). Yet He could not cease to be their God, and in the far off future, when judgment had done its work, and He had sifted them among all nations, He would return and build again the tabernacle of David that had fallen down, and plant the people on their own land, from which they should no more be plucked up (ch. ix. 11).

The prophecy might be divided into five general sections, each containing a principal idea, though not to the exclusion of the conceptions found in the other divisions.

Chap. i.-ii. A universal view of the sin of the nations and the judgment of Jehovah. Jehovah shall roar out of

Zion, and utter His voice from Jerusalem, and the breath of His anger shall wither up Carmel and the pastures of the shepherds. The lion's lair is Mount Zion, and his roar is that with which he springs upon his prey (ch. iii. 4). The judgment is universal, upon all the nations of the world as it lay under the eye of the prophet, and each nation is judged for its particular sin. The cloud laden with disaster trails round the whole horizon, discharging itself upon the nations in succession, Syria, Edom, Ammon, Moab, the Philistines, and Phœnicia, Judah included, till it settles at last over Israel. The judgment comes from Jehovah, who dwells in Zion, it falls on all the nations, and it falls on them for their sin. This sin is regarded chiefly as inhumanity or injustice, though to this on Israel's part is added ingratitude and forgetfulness of Jehovah's will.

Chap. iii.–iv. 3. The second section contains threats of judgment upon the people because of their injustice to one another and because of the oppression of the poor by the privileged classes. This oppression is such a flagrant breach of the natural law of mankind that even the heathen would shudder at it: "Publish ye in the palaces of Ashdod, and in the palaces of the land of Egypt, and say, Assemble yourselves upon the mountains of Samaria, and behold what great tumults are therein, and what great oppressions are in the midst of her" (ch. iii. 9). The spirit of cruelty and oppression has taken possession not of the men only, but of the women, who are indifferent to the sufferings of others if they can but gratify their own voluptuous desires: "Hear, ye kine of Bashan, in the mountain of Samaria, which oppress the poor, which crush the needy, which say unto their lords, Bring and let us drink" (ch. iv. 1). Therefore destruction shall be on men and women alike—on men: "Thus saith the Lord, An adversary shall there be even round about the land; and he shall bring down thy strength from thee, and thy palaces shall be spoiled" (ch. iii. 11);

and on women: "The Lord hath sworn by His holiness, that, lo, the days shall come upon you, that they shall take you away with hooks, and your offspring with fish-hooks. And ye shall go out at the breaches, every one straight before her" (ch. iv. 3).

Chap. iv. 4–v. Threats of judgment because of the false worship of the people, and their misconception of the nature of Jehovah and the true meaning of His relation to Israel.

The passage is probably an answer to a thought which the prophet felt might rise in the people's mind to obviate the force of his former threats. They deemed that they could avert the anger of Jehovah by increasing the richness of His sacrifices and the splendour of His service (ch. v. 22). The same delusion on the people's part is met by Hosea with similar words: "With their flocks and their herds shall they go to seek Jehovah; but they shall not find Him: He hath withdrawn Himself from them" (ch. v. 6). The prophet ironically invites the worshippers to redoubled assiduity in their ritual service of Jehovah: "Go to Bethel, and transgress; to Gilgal, and multiply transgression; bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes every three days; proclaim freewill offerings and publish them: for so it liketh you, ye children of Israel" (ch. iv. 4); and then suddenly turning round he bids them judge what Jehovah thought of such service: "And I on My part have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places. . . . I have withholden the rain from you, when there were yet three months to the harvest: . . . I have smitten you with blasting and mildew: . . . I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt." This assiduous ritual service of their God was in truth nothing but so much sinning; and Jehovah appeals to the people to cease from it, and *seek Him.*

Chap. vi. A threat of destruction because of the luxury of the ruling classes, their self-confidence and national pride,

and their blindness to the signs of the times and to the operations of Jehovah, which, though in a far off region as yet, were alarming enough to all who had eyes.

"Woe to them that are at ease in Zion, and that feel secure on the mountain of Samaria; that lie on beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches; that eat lambs out of the flock, and sing idle songs to the sound of the viol; that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments, but are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph; who rejoice in a thing of nought (their national power), and say, Have we not taken to us horns? Therefore shall they go captive with the first that go captive."

Chap. vii.–ix. The last three chapters contain the same idea of the destruction of the nation, but conveyed in a variety of symbols seen in vision. In chap. vii. there are three of these symbolical visions, the locusts, the fire, and the plumbline. The Lord's resolution to destroy His people and His compassion are represented as struggling with one another. The prophet intercedes twice for the people: "O Lord God, spare, I beseech thee: how shall Jacob stand? for he is small!" and twice the judgment is deferred: "The Lord repented, saying, It shall not be." At last the plumbline, the line of rectitude, must be applied to Israel: "I will not pass by them any more."

In chap. viii. there is a single symbol, that of the ripe summer fruit (*kaits*), suggesting by a play of sound that the end (*kets*) is come upon the nation, it is ripe for destruction and the harvest of Jehovah's wrath. And chap. ix. consists of a still more graphic symbol with its interpretation: the false worshippers are represented as gathered together in the temple at Bethel, and Jehovah commands to smite the pillars that the fabric may fall upon the heads of all of them —they are buried in the ruins of their false religion. And if any escape, the sword of the Lord shall pursue them, that

not one shall save himself, and all the sinners of the people shall be cut off. Then follows the bright picture of the restitution: the tabernacle of David that is fallen down shall be raised up; the kingdom shall assume its old boundaries from the sea unto the river; nature shall be transfigured; and the people shall dwell in the land given them by their God for ever.

In the prophets the two subjects that meet us are the people and Jehovah their God. The prophetic teaching is not abstract, but consists always of concrete statements regarding these two great subjects and their relations to one another. We cannot, therefore, begin by asking, What is the prophet's doctrine of God? we must inquire what his doctrine in regard to Jehovah the God of Israel is. When that is seen we may inquire what his doctrine of Jehovah implies or amounts to as a doctrine of God.

1. It does not need to be said that to the prophet Jehovah is a self-conscious Person: He swears by Himself (ch. vi. 8), or by His "holiness," that is, by His godhead, or by Himself being God (ch. iv. 2). His name is God, or Jehovah, or the Lord (*Adonai*), meaning the Sovereign (ch. iii. 7), or the Lord Jehovah (ch. viii. 3). Another name which the prophet frequently uses is Jehovah the God of hosts (ch. iv. 3; v. 16; vi. 8, 14), or Jehovah whose name is the God of hosts (ch. v. 27), or the Lord Jehovah the God of hosts (ch. iii. 13), or finally, the Lord Jehovah of hosts (ch. ix. 5). It is not quite certain how the name God or Lord of hosts took its rise, whether it was from the idea that the Lord led the armies or hosts of Israel, or from the idea that He commanded the hosts of heaven. At all events in later usage the name referred principally, if not exclusively, to the hosts of heaven. These hosts to the eye were the stars; but the stars were idealized as living, and were, or at least symbolized, the armies in heaven. To command and move these armies required omnipotent

power and suggested it; hence Isaiah says, "Lift up your eyes and behold, Who created these things? who bringeth forth their host by number, and calleth them all by their names. By the greatness of His might, for that He is strong in power, not one faileth" (ch. xl. 26). The name God or Lord of hosts is equivalent to the Almighty or Omnipotent, as the Septuagint, according to its tradition, rightly rendered (*παντοκράτωρ*). The term hosts, Sabaoth, appears to have been considered sometimes a proper name. It is remarkable that Amos never calls Jehovah the God of Israel; the nearest approach he makes to this is when he says, "Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel" (iv. 12).

2. Further, Jehovah not only possesses all power, He constantly uses it. First, in nature: He is the creator of all that exists, the most gigantic masses in the universe, as well as its most subtle influences: He made Orion and the Pleiades (ch. v. 8), He formeth the mountains and createth the wind (ch. iv. 13); He is the mover in all the movements which we observe: He turneth the darkness into the morning, and maketh the day dark with night, He calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth (ch. v. 8, iv. 13, ix. 5); His angry breath withers up Carmel (ch. i. 2); He withholds rain, sends locusts, mildew, pestilence, and overthrow (ch. iv.); He touches the earth, and it melts, and rises up, and sinks (in the oscillations of the earthquake) like the river of Egypt (ch. ix. 5). Secondly, He puts forth His power equally in the rule of the nations, moving them upon the face of the earth and according to His will, like pawns upon a board, bringing Israel from Egypt, the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir (ch. ix. 7). And as He brought the Syrians from Kir He sends them back whence they came (ch. i. 5), and Israel He causes to go into captivity beyond Damascus (ch. v. 27). It is at His command that the Assyrian comes up and overflows the land like a river; it is He that breaks for him the

bar of Damascus and launches him upon the sinful kingdom of Samaria, causing him to afflict it from Hamath unto the river of the wilderness, the border of Edom (ch. vi. 14). And the omnipresence of His power is expressed in chap. i.–ii., where He smites one nation after another, all the peoples of the known world, and in such passages as chap. ix. 8: "Behold, the eyes of the Lord Jehovah are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth"; and particularly in the terrible passage (ch. ix. 4 *seq.*) where His wrath is represented as pursuing the sinners of the people and plucking them out of every refuge, heaven, hell, the top of Carmel, the bottom of the sea, captivity among the nations; for He sets His eyes upon them for evil and not for good. And His glance penetrates equally into the spirit of men, for "He declareth unto man what is his thought" (ch. iv. 13).

3. These passages contain the expression of what is called personality in Jehovah, that He is creator, that He is ruler over all, that He has all power, is omniscient and omnipresent. Some of them also suggest what the essence of His personality is, and what the spring is which moves and guides His power and rule: it is His ethical Being. It is because of three transgressions and of four that He will overthrow nation after nation around Israel. It is because they sell the righteous for money, and turn aside the meek from his right within Israel that He will press them down as a cart presses that is full of sheaves (ch. ii. 13). It is because of the oppressions in the midst of Samaria, and for that they know not to do right that the Assyrian enemy shall encamp on the land and bring down their palaces to the ground (ch. iii. 11). It is because they turn justice to wormwood and fling righteousness to the ground (ch. v. 7); because they turn eternal principles upside down, acting as madly as if men were to drive horses upon the rock or plough the sea with oxen (ch. vi. 12), that Jehovah is raising up a nation that

will afflict them from Hamath unto Edom. There are almost no positive statements made as to what Jehovah is; we must infer what He is from what He does and what He desires: "I hate, I despise your feasts; take away from Me the noise of thy viols: but let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream" (ch. v. 21). "Seek ye Me, and ye shall live: and seek not unto Bethel. Seek good; and so Jehovah, the God of hosts, shall be with you, as ye say. Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish justice in the gate" (the court of justice, ch. v. 5, 14). What "good" is will appear immediately. "What Jehovah demands is righteousness, nothing more and nothing less; what He hates is injustice. Sin or offence to the Deity is a thing of purely moral character. Morality is that for the sake of which all other things exist, it is the alone essential thing in the world. It is no postulate, no idea, but at once a necessity and a fact; the most intensely living of personal powers—Jehovah the God of Israel." [1]

Like all the prophets, Amos is first of all a theologian and then a moralist. His doctrine of God, or rather of Jehovah the God of Israel, is the primary thing; his doctrine of men or of the people is secondary, and but a reflection of his doctrine of Jehovah, or a deduction from it. The people must be what their God is, or they can be no people of His. The relation between them is that of mind to mind, nature to nature. Hence, while he speaks abundantly of Jehovah and what He is and requires, he never takes occasion to contrast Him with other deities; and while he reprobates severely the worship of the people, it is the spirit of it, the wrong state of mind which it manifests, rather than particular practices, that he dwells upon. He differs from his successor Hosea in this respect; and hence it has been supposed that, because he does not expressly condemn the golden calves, he found nothing offensive in

[1] Wellhausen: *Hist.*, p. 472.

them. This view has been repeated so often that it may be called traditional. "Amos expresses no dread of the religious symbolism prevalent in northern Israel; like Elijah and Elisha, he lets the 'golden calves' pass without a word of protest." [1] It is questionable if this representation be true, even in the letter. Several passages are hard to reconcile with it, as this: "When I visit the transgressions of Israel upon him, I will also visit the altars of Bethel, and the horns of the altar shall be cut off, and fall to the ground" (ch. iii. 14); or the ironical invitation, "Go to Bethel, and transgress" (ch. iv. 4); or this: "They that swear by the sin of Samaria (probably the calf of Bethel), and that swear, As thy god, O Dan, liveth, shall fall and never rise up again" (ch. viii. 14); or the graphic picture of the worshippers gathered together in the temple at Bethel, which Jehovah smites and brings down upon their heads. These passages appear to carry in them a formal repudiation of the calves. Minds may differ, but if the prophet's language be not a verbal protest against the calf worship, it is because it is a great deal more; it is a protest which goes much deeper than the calves, and is directed to something behind them. The calves, and the whole ritual service as it was practised, were but symptoms of that which gave offence to the prophet, which was the spirit of the worship, the mind of the worshippers, the conception of Deity which they had in worshipping, and to which they offered their worship. Jehovah distinguishes between this service and the worship of *Him:* "Seek Me, and seek not to Bethel." Jehovah as He knows Himself, and Jehovah as He sees the people worship Him, are not one but two. They possibly thought Him their national god, to whom they were in a sense as necessary as He was to them, whose prestige and credit were involved in their preservation and prosperity; or they judged Him a sharer in their own sensuous being, and

[1] Cheyne: *Hosea*, p. xxxi. Comp. Stade: *Hist.*, p. 579.

therefore one that smelled with satisfaction the smoke of their sacrifices, and who could always be called back, when offended, by more abundant offerings, which were what He sought, and what was felt to be due: while in truth He was a purely spiritual Being, to whom sacrifices of flesh were inappreciable, whose sole desire was righteousness, being Himself, as might be said, the very ethical conception impersonated. Therefore He says, Seek good, and the Lord shall be with you, as ye say. The term "good" is used in other prophets, just as in Amos, to describe moral in contrast to ritual service, as by Micah: "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? . . . He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (ch. vi. 7.)

The truth appears to be, that the difficulty does not lie where it has been laid, namely, in Amos' failure to protest against the calves, as if he stood on a lower platform than his successor Hosea, who does protest against them; the difficulty lies in an opposite quarter: the prophet doth protest too much. His stringent doctrine of the moral Being of Jehovah appears to lead him to discard all ritual service as worthless or even false. The service which Jehovah desires is a just and humane life among one's fellow men, and humility before Himself (ch. vi.). The prophet has already transcended his own economy, and stands by the side of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." To us, with our views of the central place of sacrifice in the old economy, this is rather perplexing; not, of course, that he should speak thus, but that he should speak only thus. The explanation possibly is, that he had in view merely the people's abuse of the idea of sacrifice; what its just uses were it did not fall to him

to state. If, however, it were objected to him that he sets too great store by good works, he would probably reply with the apostle, Forgive me this wrong.

When we observe two ideas expressed by a writer, one of which might be a deduction from the other, the temptation is great to regard the ideas as so related. The prophet's universalistic conception of Jehovah, his view that He is God over all, might be the natural conclusion from Jehovah's purely ethical Being. For it is not easy to see how a purely moral being can have any relations but those which are moral, and therefore universal—unless, indeed, the other relations be of a temporary kind, and existing for the purpose of realizing the universal relation. And there are some signs in the prophet's Book that his general conception of Jehovah put his faith in His special relation to Israel under a certain strain. His principles would have led him to ask with St. Paul, "Is God the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentiles?" And in point of fact he does put a similar question: "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto Me, O house of Israel? saith the Lord." The remark has been made in regard to Hosea that "as a rule, like Amos, he speaks of Jehovah as the national God of the Hebrews."[1] The remark needs modification, or at least interpretation, in regard to both the prophets. The term "national" carries an ambiguity in it. All the prophets and Old Testament writers operate with nations or peoples. The nation is to their minds the unit of organization and life. Even the new covenant of Jeremiah is made with the people; though it operates first upon individuals, it is in order to gather them into a people. This is partly a mode of thought and need not have any religious significance at all. The religious *differentia* lies entirely in the nature of the relation between the god and the nation. In the heathen Shemitic religions this relation is natural or

[1] Cheyne: *Hosea*, as above.

even physical; in both the prophets referred to it is moral or spiritual. The prophet Amos does not even make use of the expression Jehovah, "God of Israel," he employs the term God of hosts, which expresses his broad conception of Jehovah. The first two chapters of the Book are of particular value in regard to this point. There Jehovah chastises all the nations because of their breach of the natural law of humanity and mercy written on men's hearts, of which law He is the guardian because He is the impersonation of it. His relation to the heathen nations is not mediate but direct; He does not punish them as God of Israel and because they have offended against His people. Even when their cruelties have been committed on Israel, this is not the point that calls forth the judgment; it is the inhuman cruelty itself, the breach of a law known to all men. But it is not only offences against Israel that He resents; He watches the conduct of the heathen nations to one another, such as Moab and Edom, and upholds among them the law of the human mind, throwing His shield of protection even over those feelings of men which though sacred might seem in some sort sentimental: He destroys Moab because they burnt the bones of the king of Edom into lime.[1]

The question of the relation of God to the people Israel is a difficult one, on which men even now differ. Our Lord teaches that salvation is of the Jews, as the prophets taught before Him (Isa. ii., xlii., etc.). And we might suppose that the Saviour of mankind having come forth from Israel the purpose of God in its election had been fulfilled, and that Jew and Gentile now stood on a level as common sharers in God's love to "the world." There are many devout Christians who think differently, believing that

[1] The passage 2 Kings iii. 27 is probably to the same effect, and is even more remarkable, inasmuch as the "indignation" was against Israel, who had pressed their ruthless warfare so far as to drive the king of Moab to the inhuman act of immolating his son.

God's relation to Israel is still in some sense "national," and that the results of it are not yet exhausted. At all events, when Amos, though upholding the special relation of Jehovah to Israel, speaks to the people in the name of the Lord, "You only have I known of all the nations of the earth, therefore will I visit your transgressions upon you"; and when he teaches that Jehovah will sift out all the sinners of the people, that at last He may be God of a righteous nation,—he introduces an element which modifies the idea of "national" to such an extent as almost to reverse it, and which makes the use of such a term to describe the prophet's conception of the relation of Jehovah to Israel very misleading.

Very probably the prophet did not make the use of his conceptions that we think he might have done. His picture of the final condition of the world looks contracted. It is certainly a miniature, but possibly it suggests as many thoughts as if it had filled more canvas.—The broken fragments of the people shall be restored, and the house of David shall rule over a united Israel; the people shall be all righteous, and nature transfigured shall be supernaturally kind; the kingdom of Jehovah shall regain its widest boundaries, from the sea to the river, and embrace all the nations on which Jehovah's name had ever been named.—This extent of the kingdom of the Lord might seem petty; yet it was virtually the world as Amos knew it. His successors, who saw the vast empires of Assyria and Babylon, have a larger idea of the world, but not another idea. Their wider view of the world might enlarge their thoughts of Jehovah, but this prophet's conception of the relation of Jehovah to the "world" does not differ from their conception of it.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

THE AGONY IN THE GARDEN.

AGONY! This terrible word, used but this once in Scripture, might not have found its way into our language but for its application by St. Luke to the mysterious suffering of our Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane. A term originally descriptive of the desperate struggle often witnessed in the sacred games of Greece, it implies the utmost severity of contest; it pictures to us the condition of one in the last extremity of conflict, whose sweat might be as great blood-drops upon his body, who falls exhausted, yet a victor, and whose name is thenceforth inscribed on the tablet of everlasting fame. The Evangelist could find no other word by which fitly to express the last crisis of that awful hour, and spoke of his Lord as "being in an agony." But to utter that word is almost more than the Christian heart can bear. We may well fear to approach that sacred anguish, an anguish of the soul, which nearly destroyed the bodily frame. No scene in our Lord's life inspires such awe—not even the cross, with all its accompaniments of terror. All men may gather round the cross and behold the silent Sufferer there, He was "lifted up" for that; but surely only a faithful few may dare to look while the Lord falls upon His face, and pours forth cries and tears! Such only would we now invite to stand afar off, and reverently gaze upon, and strive to understand that sorrow like unto no other sorrow.

In reading the narratives we are struck with the fact that, of the four Evangelists, John alone, the man whom Jesus loved, the man of tenderest heart, and the only eye-witness of them all, says nothing of this terrible scene. He simply tells us that our Lord, after His great priestly prayer, "went forth with His disciples over the brook Kidron, where was a garden, into the which He entered,

and His disciples. And Judas also, which betrayed Him, knew the place: for Jesus ofttimes resorted thither with His disciples." Of what passed within that Garden before the betrayer came he is silent. Did *he* feel that agony to be as it were a sacred secret? Did his loving hand falter in the attempt to record that hour of anguish? We know not; but the minute and generally consenting accounts of the other three Evangelists can leave no doubt of the historic fact; and if none were, like John, an eye-witness, the indications that Peter, another eye-witness, superintended the narrative of St. Mark is not to be forgotten. This Evangelist is alone in recording that, upon our Lord's second visit and rebuke to His sleeping Apostles, "they wist not what to answer Him," a similar condition of mind to that of St. Peter at the Transfiguration, "he wist not what to say." Mark however says nothing of the angel, and differs from the others in substituting "hour" for "cup" in one part of our Lord's petition. Matthew gives the longest account, but does not mention the angel; Luke alone speaks of the angelic apparition, and, notwithstanding his brevity in other respects, gives us two other circumstances, omitted by the other Evangelists, that the distance to which our Lord withdrew Himself from the disciples was "about a stone's cast"; and that, "being in an agony" and praying the "more earnestly," "His sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground." Luke, we must remember, undertook "to set forth in order those things most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses"; while with respect to the last point, may we not believe that as a physician it was peculiarly interesting to him?

Putting all the accounts together, we may "set forth in order" the events of which Gethsemane was the central scene somewhat in this way. After the company in the

upper room had sung or chanted the Passover Psalm which concluded the supper, after the consoling discourse that followed, after the wonderful intercessory prayer in which the Lord while He prays, yet speaks as being one "with the Father," He says, "Arise, let us go hence." Perhaps these words were first spoken, as they occur in the narrative, at a pause in the discourse, which was resumed as the disciples, loath to depart, lingered with appealing looks to their Lord, who had just said, "Hereafter I will not talk much with you," and they gain thereby the words of "good cheer" and the consecrating prayer. But the time for departure comes at last; they arise and go forth from the upper chamber—from the gate of the rejecting city. They descend into the deep ravine, and, as it seems, Peter on the way re-asserts his constancy, declaring, "the more vehemently, If I should die with Thee, I will not deny Thee in any wise," and receives a second warning from his foreseeing Lord. Here too apparently occur the question and answer about the sword, only to be understood as referring to the time when the Lord, having departed into a far country to receive His kingdom, His disciples would need from time to time some immediate means of defence against their enemies.

Then they come to the brook—the winter torrent in its dark bed—the brook Kidron, crossed now by the Son of David, as David himself had crossed it in his misery, driven from Jerusalem and seeking refuge in the wilderness where no man dwelt; the brook too which in its lower course received the blood of the daily sacrifices brought by conduits from the Temple courts. It was crossed, and the Lord led the way to the probably walled inclosure of the Olive orchard, where was an olive press to crush the fruit of the olive, that it might yield its precious oil. (Let us note every hint of symbolism.) The shade of the trees would be only the darker for the light of the paschal moon, but

from the mention later of torches, and other indications, we may judge that it was obscured by the winter clouds. Then Jesus turns and says to His disciples, "Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder." But He takes with Him the three who alone had seen His glory on the Holy Mount, and were now alone to witness His deep humiliation. How far the "yonder" meant does not appear; it must have been sufficient to seclude Him from the body of the disciples, but as they were sitting under the thick umbrage of the trees, the distance need not have been great. Then as He steps slowly on to reach the spot, "He began to be greatly amazed and sore troubled"; and He says, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." He that had lately in His Divine strength uttered the words, "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me," now in human weakness seems like to sink under some approaching and amazing horror, fatal it might be to bodily endurance, and seeks human companionship. Then again He stops and says, "Tarry ye here, and watch with Me," a charge reserved for these His favoured friends. Yet still, impelled as by a fearful necessity, He went forward a little—the "stone's cast," and then—strange sight! —fell on the ground, fell on His face, and in the stillness of the night air are heard the words, "Abba, Father, all things are possible unto Thee; take away this cup from Me: nevertheless not what I will, but what Thou wilt." Then silence, and the watchers, still probably in the dark shade of trees, fail in their watch and sleep. They are awakened by the voice of their Lord, returned amongst them, and addressing Peter with the words, "Simon, sleepest *thou?* couldest not *thou* watch one hour? Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation"; adding, with compassionate excuse for him and for all, "the spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak."

Again He went away, again they hear the same unwonted

words of anguished prayer, again there is silence, and again their eyes are heavy, and they sleep. How long they know not, but presently He is again amongst them, and He asks: "Why sleep ye?" and they, bewildered and ashamed, know not how to answer Him. Before they can do so, He has left them, and a third time He is heard to pray, now as "in an agony," "the more earnestly," but in the same words at once of appeal and of submission. Then—is there not a light that falls upon the prostrate form? Does not the sound of another voice reach their ears? Is not their Lord lifted as by unseen hands? and are not drops as of blood stanched upon His forehead? Surely an angel speaks to Him! So they whisper one to another. But the light fades, the darkness closes, the silence is again unbroken; and, worn with the emotions of the day, again they sleep. Once more the Lord returns, and calm now, resuming the manner of the Master, says: "Sleep on now, and take your rest: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners." Then, it may be catching the light of torches borne along the hillside, and detecting perhaps the dark figure of the betrayer, He turns, and bids them "Rise up, let us go; lo, he that betrayeth Me is at hand."

What was it that happened during this tremendous hour, so unparalleled in the history of our Lord? How came it that, deprived of, or laying aside, His Divine power, His naked human soul seemed exposed for a time to some crushing horror? What was that horror?

The office of the Apostolic body was to expound our Lord's life and mission, but to them we look in vain for an explanation of this mystery. They scarcely even refer to it. In all their writings there occurs but one obvious allusion to this terrible crisis, the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Who in the days of His flesh, when He

had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared; though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered." John, who says nothing in his Gospel, is equally silent in his Epistle upon this agony of his Lord. Peter, if he authorized the account given in Mark, yet makes no reference to the event in his Epistles. The words: "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you: but rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings," might have been thought to include a reference to this the severest of His sufferings, did not the previous phrase, "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh," appear in clear connexion with the statement that "Christ once suffered for sins, . . . being *put to death* in the flesh." James, the remaining member of the privileged three, perished too soon to allow of any epistle from his hand. The other James, "the Lord's brother," speaks of "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man," and instances Elias, "a man subject to like passions as we are, and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain"; but he makes no allusion to the great example of "fervent prayer" given by our Lord in the garden—a prayer which we are told was heard and answered. Jude says nothing. St. Paul, unless he were the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is silent also—a remarkable silence when we consider the variety and fulness of his writings, and the revelation which he claimed to have "received of the Lord" concerning the doctrines of the Faith, and which enabled him to become a wise master-builder in the Church. The single reference in the Epistle to the Hebrews we shall recur to farther on.

This silence on the part of those endued with power from on high to go and teach all nations, is the more

significant when we contrast it with the fulness and the reiteration with which they speak of the Lord's death and its purpose. To them that death is the great sacrificial act which, superseding the old, establishes the new economy. It is "the shedding of blood"—"the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot"—"without which there is no remission" of sins. With them it is the Cross and not the garden, upon which all men are to fix their regard. It is as lifted upon the Cross that all men will be drawn unto Him. It is the Cross that finds a place on almost every page of the Apostolic writings.

We are led then to the conclusion that, whatever might be the necessity for that awful hour, it had no immediate connexion with the great sacrificial act through which is obtained remission of sins. It could not have been then that "His soul was made an offering for sin." It could not have been then that He was "made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." It could not have been then that He "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." It could not have been then that He bore the sins which "He bare in His own body on the tree." It could not have been the great atoning act, or any vital portion of it.

We return then to the question, What was the nature of our Lord's suffering in the Garden? As at least suggesting an answer, we would direct attention to our Lord's words after He had entered upon the "hour": "Watch and pray, lest ye enter into Temptation." He was surely not then thinking of the temptation to sleep when His disciples should have watched, nor of the temptation to which Peter would soon succumb, nor of the temptation which had swallowed up Judas. He was now in the hour of His agony? Was it not rather that His own soul was under the shadow of temptation? Was He not Himself in conflict with the Tempter?

Following this clue, we remember that, after the temptation in the wilderness, "the Devil departed from Him for a season,"—for a "season" only—and would assuredly return. That first foiling was not to be accepted as defeat; it but tested the strength of this second Adam who had come into the world. We have, on the contrary, indications that during our Lord's ministry the Evil One was repeatedly close at hand. The strange demoniac possessions encountered so often by our Lord, some of which none but He could expel; the words that our Lord occasionally let fall: "I give unto you power over all the power of the Enemy"; "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven"; "Now shall the Prince of this world be cast out"; "Get thee behind me, Satan" (as Peter remonstrated against the suffering and death of which his Lord spoke); and again on this very night, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat: but I have made supplication for thee, that (under that sifting) thy faith fail not." These are all intimations that the Devil, whose works He came to destroy, mindful of the peril of his kingdom, was not far off. And is it not certain that this ever returning Enemy would make a last supreme effort? Would not, in this case, the Master be as the disciple, and be subjected to a yet more terrible sifting? Did not our Lord refer to such a coming struggle when, after the supper, He said, "The Prince of this world cometh, but hath nothing in Me"? Is it without significance that the same night, immediately after the scene in the Garden, our Lord said to the rabble multitude, "This is your hour, and *the power of darkness*"? Is it not then a probable supposition that in Gethsemane our Lord encountered a last and most deadly assault of the Evil One?

And there is something in the circumstances that supports this supposition. There was the strange denuding of Divine power apparent in the change from calm supremacy and

lofty intercession to the state of human weakness, sorrow, amaze, oppression as unto death. This denudation was needful, may we not say, if the Lord, "made like unto His brethren," was to be "tempted in all points" like unto them, needful that He should meet even the most deadly power of the Tempter, not in His Divine nature, but in ours, so that He might overcome for us? Do we not see also an indication of simple humanity in the leaning of our Lord upon human companionship; His taking with Him the three, with the charge to watch with Him; His return again and again, as seeking human sympathy? Do not those pauses, as in a tempest of the soul, suggest baffled but renewed assault—a triple assault as in the wilderness—a cessation for a brief space, but the consciousness of our Lord that the conflict was not ended, that the Adversary would return? Does it not appear as if there were an added fury in each attack, till at the last the Saviour "being in an agony, His sweat was as great drops of blood falling on the ground"? Does it not seem as if some Power were bent upon crushing the very life out of the bodily frame—yes, so that He should *not* be "lifted up and draw all men unto Him," so that He should perish there and then in that darkness, in that Garden? Is there not something appropriate to the coming of this true King of Terrors in the darkness itself? Well might the moon refuse to give her light at such an hour, and a horror of great darkness wrap the Saviour round, and leave Him alone with the Power of darkness!

Is it not again appropriate to such a contest as this with supernatural Power, that when it is ended a supernatural being, one of those "that minister to the heirs of salvation," should, as at the ending of the first temptation, appear to restore the fainting strength of the Son of man?

Let us now look at the passage already quoted, the only one in the Apostolic writings which obviously refers to this

agony of our Lord, and which the New Version renders, "Who in the days of His flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from (or out of) death, and having been heard for His godly fear, though He was a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered." The words "out of death," favour, it will be seen, the supposition that the death feared was a then present peril; and the words "for his godly fear" may certainly imply a godly fear of evil, under whatever form He might be contending with it. But it is the argument of the context that supplies the key to the understanding of the passage. This is concisely stated in the fifteenth verse of the preceding chapter. "For we have not a High Priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Here the being subject to temptation is set forth as the special way in which our High Priest took part in our infirmities. He is spoken of farther on as having "in the days of His flesh offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears,"—a conjunction which surely suggests that the occasion was one in which He was subject to some form of temptation. May we not also derive some confirmation of this view from the passage in the second chapter, which, speaking of the sufferings of Christ, describes Him as "the Captain of our salvation,"—the Captain who has Himself advanced to meet the foe, Himself has suffered the stress of battle, Himself struck down the foremost Adversary, and has thus led the way to victory?

We have spoken of this passage in the Hebrews as the only Apostolic allusion to this sacred agony; but is it not possible that there may be a reference to it also in the 12th chapter of the same epistle, where the writer urges to laying "aside every weight (cumbrance), and the sin which

doth so closely cling about us (as a garment), and let us run with patience (or endurance) the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith: who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and hath sat down on the right hand of the throne of God. For consider Him, . . . that ye wax not weary, fainting in your souls. Ye *have not yet resisted, unto blood, striving against sin.*" Here, in the first instance, the idea of a race is plainly present to the writer's mind—the divesting of encumbrance, the weariness, the faintness, the sitting down of a previous victor in the place of honour. The cross is no doubt referred to as the open culmination of the Saviour's sufferings, but is not this a divergence of thought? Does not the idea of a race recur to the writer's mind in the exhortation to "wax not weary," etc.? while in the words, "ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin," may it not be that the blood drops of the agony are referred to, and not the blood shed on the cross, since striving against sin, appropriate to a contest with the Evil One, is not appropriate to the passive endurance of the cross.

However this may be, we cannot but think that whatever illustration may be gathered from other parts of Scripture favours the hypothesis of our Lord's subjection at this last hour, before He was delivered up into the hands of sinners to suffer all they could inflict upon the body, to a trial of soul unshielded by Divine Power, at the hands of the great Adversary, the works of whom He came, in the likeness of sinful flesh, to destroy.

Do we derogate from the Saviour's Divine majesty in this supposition? Or is it inconsistent with the authority He had previously displayed over the powers of evil? Is there not, we reply, evidence that He now laid aside that majesty? and how could that authority have been exercised at the time that He was tempted? He had shown indeed His

complete control over all the powers of Hell before the eyes of the people, but that became Him as Immanuel—"God with us." In this narrative He is explicitly set before us in an hour of human weakness, "learning obedience through the things that He suffered."

But if Temptation, what was the nature of that Temptation? We are not told, but may we not reverently ponder this deep mystery? May we not recur to the Temptation in the wilderness as some guide to our thoughts? We know that the offer of the kingdoms of this world was then made, and made in vain. We know that the suggestion to test His Divine sonship by turning the stones of the barren wilderness into bread, or by casting Himself headlong from the temple battlements, was rejected. Might not now, under the close prospect of exposure to the rage of men, and the torture of the cross, *doubt of the Father's love* be urged upon the Saviour's soul by all the arts of him who was a liar from the beginning—by all the apparatus at the command of infernal malignity—by all the power of him who possessed the power of death?

The trial of Job was the question of the Divine righteousness. He was conscious of righteousness himself, and could not understand how a righteous, a just God could subject him to such misery. To Christians who have apprehended the Divine love—love as the essential attribute in the Divine Fatherhood—is not doubt of this love, as under stress of bitter sorrow it sometimes comes upon the soul, is it not the worst bitterness? is it not the supreme temptation, and the most fatal? If our Lord was "in all points tempted like as we are," would not this temptation have its turn? and if so, when more fitly, when more dangerously than at the moment when, though He was a Son, He was about to be "put to grief," and made a curse? Surely then, if ever, "the terrors of Hell gat hold upon Him, and He found trouble and sorrow." "The

Father," might the Tempter say, "does not the Father fail you?—fail you even at this hour?—fail you as you cry, and cry, yea, this three times in vain, that Thou mightest be saved from this hour?" Let us imagine all this urged by the personal power of the great Adversary upon the unaided humanity of the Lord, and might He not be nigh unto perishing? Might it not indeed, as we have already intimated, be the final aim and desperate effort of the Evil One that this Son of man, now withstanding him alone in the darkness, should, if unconquered, die?

Our Lord overcame, but how? By the one prayer three times repeated in which He cast Himself upon the Father—Father still! "All things," He cries, "are possible unto THEE; Thy power is infinite, power to save." "Out of the depths will I cry unto THEE," and "Thou wilt set My feet upon a rock." "Father, if it be possible, let this hour"—this cup of anguish in the thought that Thy love fails—"let this cup pass from Me!" "Yet—yet—not *My* will—My will encompassed with infirmity, wrestling to the death with this mighty One, this spiritual wickedness whose hour it is—no, not *My* will, but *Thy* will, the holy, the perfect will of God." How different this, the prayer of "the Son of man," from that so recently uttered when, as Son of God, He said, "Father, I will that those whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am"!

> "Go to dark Gethsemane
> Ye that feel the Tempter's power."

These words aptly express the lesson, as we would read it, of this great scene, the meaning of which has not always, as we think, been so clearly apprehended as by the Christian poet. It has been confused with other issues, with other portions of the great Redemption. And if the nature of the Temptation be obscure, it will be enough to know that He suffered being tempted—"tempted in all

points like as we are"—and that He is able thus to succour them that are tempted. Oh the mystery of God manifest in flesh!—the great secret of Christianity, into which if angels desire to look, how much more those for whose sake "He took not on Him the nature of angels, but took on Him the seed of Abraham," and was "in all things made like unto His brethren"!

JOSIAH GILBERT.

THE WORK OF BIBLE REVISION IN GERMANY.

II.

CRITICAL PART.

BEFORE we attempt to put the English reader in a position for estimating the worth of the so-called "Probebibel," we give, on behalf of those who wish for more precise information, a list of the most important critiques, which have appeared in a pamphlet form—thus not, or not merely, in magazines.

Plitt, *Die Revision der lutherischen Bibelübersetzung und die Halle'sche Probebibel von* 1883. Karrlsruhe, 1884; pp. 39.

L. Krummel, *Die Probebibel.* Heidelberg, 1885; pp. 70.

H. Opitz, *Zur Revision der Luther'schen Uebersetzung des neuen Testamentes. Ein Urtheil über die Probebibel.* Leipzig, 1884; pp. 69.

E. Walter, *Die sprachliche Behandlung des Textes in der Probebibel.* Bernburg, 1885; pp. 16.

E. Walter, *Die Sprache der revidirten Lutherbibel.* Bernburg, 1885; pp. 58.

O. H. Th. Willkomm, *Was ist von der beabsichtigten Revision der Luther'schen Bibelübersetzung zu halten?* Zwickau, 1884; pp. 24.

E. Haack, *Wider die Hallesche Probebibel. Auch ein Appell an die lutherische Kirche.* Leipzig, 1885; pp. 34.

E. Haack, *Noch einmal pro domo und contra Schlottmann in Sachen der Probebibel.* Leipzig, 1885; pp. 25.

Th. Hossbach, *Die revidierte Lutherbibel.* Berlin, 1884; pp. 16.

M. Schwalb, *Kritik der revidierten Lutherbibel.* Berlin, 1884; pp. 36.

E. Zittel, *Die Revision der Lutherbibel.* Berlin, 1885; pp. 47.

P. de Lagarde, *Die revidierte Lutherbibel des Halleschen Waisenhauses.* Goettingen, 1885; pp. 40.

The majority of the strict Lutherans are on principle opponents of the work of revision. Luther's version, say they, is the property of the German Lutheran Church, and must not therefore, save as regards single, trifling, and not startling amendments, be altered. By important alterations not only would great offence be given to the simple Bible-believing reader, conversant with the words of Luther's Bible, but likewise not a few German hymns would be deprived more or less of their Biblical support. The main exponents of this tendency are Chr. E. Luthardt in Leipzig, and Th. Kliefoth in Schwerin (Mecklenburg), comp. *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, Nos. 2 and 15; as, moreover, E. Haack. Such a clinging to the letter of Luther's work is, however, neither according to the mind of the great Reformer nor according to the mind of all true Lutherans; the subsequently renowned Klaus Harms, in the year 1817 (when he was archdeacon in Kiel), laid down the following theses among others:

"53. A translation, however, into a living language, must be revised every hundred years, that it may continue in life.

"54. It has been a hindrance to the influence of religion that this has not been done. The Bible Societies ought to prepare a revised Lutheran Bible-translation."

In life it often happens that extremes meet; so also in the rejection of the work of revision, adherents of two otherwise diametrically opposite theological tendencies are agreed. The reasons adduced, however, by the spokesmen of the left are, without doubt, the much more valid and important ones; and only the disparaging tone in which these men frequently express their judgment on the laborious work of the Revisers, and the fact that they pay no regard, or no sufficient regard, to the feelings of the believing laity and the practical requirements of the Church, have occasioned that their statements have made less impression than they might otherwise have made (comp. *e.g.* Schwalb). Particularly harsh, and sometimes very unjust, is the judgment of P. de Legarde.

If we would rightly appreciate the work of revision, as respects the correction of Luther's version, we have first to ask: What was the task assigned to the revisers? The Eisenach Conference had resolved in the year 1863, that "the comparatively few [!] passages, in the first place of the New Testament, whose alteration, in other words correction, might appear necessary and unobjectionable [!] in the interest of the understanding of Scripture, should be restored in a manner faithfully according with the sense, and as far as possible from the linguistic treasure of the Luther Bible, in conformity with the original text." These terms were essentially satisfied by the New Testament which appeared in 1870, wherein the translation of about eighty passages had been corrected; and the Commission appointed for the Old Testament has done considerably more than was enjoined on it, for the canonical books of the Old Testament show about three thousand real alterations, the Apocrypha about one thousand.

The matter wears another complexion, however, when it is asked: Was the task rightly defined? and is that which has been rendered to be characterized as objectively good,

as satisfying all legitimate claims? To this question we must, alas! return answer in the negative.

Considering the high estimation in which Luther's translation is held among all believing Protestants of German tongue, it is certainly justifiable that, in connexion with every work of revision, the effort should be made to preserve for the German Bible as far as possible the impress of Luther's spirit. Absolute verbal exactness need not be striven after, nay, ought not to be striven after; for often a somewhat divergent German turn reproduces the sense much better for the German reader than a slavishly verbal translation of the original text. Particularly in those passages which have become familiar and endeared to the layman owing to their employment in worship and in the Church's hymns, one must be cautious in making alterations. On various grounds (that of attachment, history of exegesis, history of the German language) it is necessary that the original form of Luther's work be not lost, but retained for all time.

The translation of Luther, however, must not occupy the same position which the Vulgate does with the Roman Catholics, but must in such wise be revised from time to time, on behalf of those to whom the immutable, and alone authentic, original texts are inaccessible, that it shall admit the certain and acknowledged results of advanced science, and so, as far as possible, afford a substitute for the originals. So soon as the *that* (the ὅτι) of the corrections is resolved on—and the opposition in principle to corrections is, as we have mentioned, unprotestant—we must also be consistent and expunge all that is really incorrect. Where the erroneousness of the rendering is beyond doubt, but there is a want of unanimity as to that which is to replace it, the course which commends itself is to indicate the other possibility (possibilities) on the margin. It is no harm if the layman also is reminded here and there that the

investigation of Holy Scripture is no light undertaking. Unhappily the revisers, feeling themselves bound by the resolution of the Eisenach Conference, were not self-consistent; they have, it is true, made many amendments, particularly in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, but likewise left many errors untouched. 2 Kings vii. 5, 7, *nèsheph* denotes not "diluculum," but "crepusculum." Ps. i. 2, *jèhge* is not "redet" (speaks), but "nachsinnt" (meditates); cf. Josh. i. 8, where the same verb is more correctly rendered "betrachte." Ps. xxii. 17 [16], "Sie haben meine Hände und Füsse durchgraben," does not stand in the original text; *kaărî* signifies "wie ein Löwe" (as a lion). Ps. xxix. 6, *rᵉêm* is not "Einhorn" (μονόκερως), but "Büffel" (buffalo). Numerous other instances are to be found in several of the above-mentioned pamphlets.

The mode of procedure adopted with regard to Textual Criticism is altogether unsatisfactory. Luther translated the New Testament from the second edition of Erasmus (1519). The verdict of Professor Edward Reuss of Strassburg on this text is, that it was "more of a mercantile business than a scientific undertaking, and was got up (bearbeitet) hastily and with very inadequate aids." And Franz Delitzsch has shown that the concluding part of the Apocalypse was translated by Erasmus, who had no Greek manuscript for these verses, out of the Vulgate into the Greek (cf. Delitzsch, *Handschriftliche Funde*, i., Leipzig, 1861). And this text has been in substance retained by the revisers of the New Testament, and only amended by them in a few places (cf. *Probebibel*, p. liv.). The fruits of the labour of J. Mill, Albr. Bengel, J. J. Wetstein, J. J. Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort have been left unturned to account. There is thus much still printed in the "Probebibel" as the word of God, which exists in none of the earliest manuscripts, nor is to be found with any of the earliest Church Fathers. I do not

need to prove that Luther's version, even on this account, must once more be submitted to a thorough revisal. The textual criticism of the Old Testament has not made such great advances; as for Luther, so also for the present day, the main demand in a translation is that the Massoretic text be accurately rendered. Now it not rarely happens that this text is corrupt; in many passages it stands so that the undoubtedly correct reading may be discovered from a parallel passage, from the context, or from the ancient translations, in others so that nothing certain is to be determined regarding the emendation to be made. In regard to neither case is the procedure of the Revisers either clear or consistent. Many deviations from the original text have not been indicated at all, in the case of others square brackets have been employed; on more than one occasion manifestly false readings have been left without the sign of corruptness being added (*e.g.* 1 Sam. xiii. 1; 2 Sam. xv. 7). The square brackets [ ] serve often as a sign that something is to be expunged, as 1 Sam. vi. 12; often as a sign that something has been added, as 1 Chron. vi. 61 (Hebr. text, vi. 46).

The Treatment of the Language has given very great offence, particularly in pædagogic circles, and with good reason. The German language is a living tongue, one undergoing constant further development and mutation. How greatly the German language has changed within the last three centuries and a half is seen upon a mere cursory glance at the work of Bindseil, to which I have alluded in the first article. The language of the printed Bible has, specially under the influence of Diekmann and the Halle Institute, been gradually modernised, made to approach more nearly to the present of a particular time; this modernising, however, has been carried out neither in a skilful nor in a consistent manner, so that a thorough revision of the linguistic garb of the Luther-bible was

called for. What demands, then, have we to make upon such a revision? It is self-evident that the language of the Bible must in itself produce upon the reader the impression that he has before him an extraordinary book. Many an archaic form, therefore, may be retained in the word-treasure and in the constructions. But these archaisms must neither be unintelligible nor too startling. In consequence of the rhyme and rhythm archaisms are easily preserved in the Church's hymns; what has in this way, or by means of proverbs and the like, been prevented from entirely disappearing from the mind of the people, may still be retained, notably in so far as it is yet to be found in recent editions of the Luther-bible. But it is an error artificially to preserve in the Bible archaisms which have become altogether foreign to the people, and to render them in some measure intelligible only by means of a glossary bound up with the text; and a yet greater error to attempt to recall such archaisms to life, after they had already disappeared from the editions of the Bible now in use. Unhappily the "Probebibel" is not free from these mistakes; cf. Zittel, p. 22 sqq.; de Lagarde, p. 3 sqq.; Plitt, p. 15 sqq. (who says that the language of the Proof-bible is in many places partly unintelligible, partly inelegant), and others. Dr. Frommann (Nürnberg), who was charged with the shaping of the linguistic garb, is a learned Germanist, and in particular the best living connoisseur of the language of Luther, and he has without doubt acquired great merit by the removal of many errors which had crept in; but his labour must be subjected to a thorough super-revision at the hands of men experienced in teaching, in order that it may become of use, *i.e.* intelligible, for the laity, and more especially for the school.

Of comparative insignificance are the remaining *desiderata*, to which I have to give expression with regard to the "Probebibel." The Transcription of the Proper Names

leaves much to be desired, by the further particularising of which here nothing is to be gained. Yet for English readers, no less than Germans, the following proposal will be of interest. Several kings of Judah and Israel notably bear the same name. Professor Kamphausen has recommended that for the kings of Judah the fuller form be everywhere employed (Ahazyahu, Yehoram, Yehoash, Yehoaḥaz), for the Israelite kings the shorter form (Ahazya, Yoram, Yoash, Yoaḥaz). The understanding of the Old Testament history would be essentially facilitated by compliance with this advice; we recommend, therefore, that the example set by Kamphausen be followed throughout.

The Division into Chapters in the different impressions of Luther's Bible frequently deviates from the division in the editions of the Hebrew Old Testament. In a few cases the Revisers have brought about an identity, in others not. Certainly the division in the Hebrew impressions is in many places an awkward one; nevertheless it must be retained, and where wanting restored, in order that it may be possible at once to consult all citations at pleasure, whether in the original or in the translation.

In the Historic Books the traditional dates have been added to the names of the kings in the superscriptions of the sections. It has been proved, however, notably by the the results obtained by the exploration of the cuneiform inscriptions, that these dates are in part incorrect; only it is not yet known what are the true years. For this reason there should be given, at a suitable place, instead of these dates, a list in double columns of the rulers of the two kingdoms, wherein the fully assured synchronisms are indicated.

In the above report on the Bible Revision in Germany, I have dwelt almost exclusively on the imperfections of the work, in the hope of thus affording so much the greater incentive to the readers of THE EXPOSITOR. In conclusion,

however, I will not omit emphatically to state that the "Probebibel" possesses very great excellences in comparison with all other editions of Luther's Bible. We should deeply lament it, if the Revisers were to suffer themselves to be deterred by the severity, and even acrimony, with which the Proof-bible has been assailed on many sides, from testing the substance of the objections raised, and so far as possible paying regard to them. The removal of the incongruous archaisms would in itself suffice to render the Proof-bible a work of which the universal introduction and recognition were desirable. Notwithstanding, since every fresh revisal of the Bible must deeply stir the minds of believers, we would fain give expression to the urgent wish that the Revisers may persevere for the sake of the kingdom of God, until such time as their labour shall be brought to a completion which shall afford a lasting satisfaction. Unhappily there is reason to fear that the multitude of faults found, the contradictory views expressed in the critiques, and the opposition of the extreme parties, will exert a discouraging, nay deterrent effect upon the Revisers. God grant that this toilsome labour may, nevertheless, bring forth abundant fruit.

HERMANN L. STRACK.

Berlin.

GOLD, BEDOLACH, AND SHOHAM STONE.

A GEOGRAPHICAL AND MINERALOGICAL STUDY OF GENESIS II., *VERSES* 10 *TO* 14.

THE site of Eden and the identification of its rivers have been among the most vexed questions of Biblical geography; and while the most extravagant hypotheses have been put forward with much ability and learning, many of the more

judicious expositors of the Bible have practically given up the question as incapable of solution. It is not the purpose of the writer to review the various theories on this difficult subject, but to indicate a new line of evidence respecting it, based on the known facts as to the geology and physical geography of Western Asia, and more especially on the interesting fragment of ancient mineralogy which forms the heading of this article.

In considering any ancient topographical description, it is necessary to ascertain if possible the standpoint, or assumed standpoint, of the writer with reference to place and time. This is equally important whether we regard these as real or only imaginary. I do not by any means admit that the standpoint of the writer of Genesis ii. is assumed or unreal. On the contrary, the facts to be stated in the sequel tend to confirm our belief in the antiquity and genuineness of the document, as well as in the accuracy of the writer; but the view now stated is independent of these considerations.

With reference then to the geographical position of the writer of the description of Eden in the second chapter of Genesis, it is I think apparent that this is not in Egypt or Palestine, but rather on or near the river Euphrates. This is shown by the manner of his treatment of the four rivers to which he refers. Three of them he describes by ethnical or other characters. The fourth, Euphrates, he merely names, as if no geographical identification was needed. In any topographical description so arranged, it seems fair to assume that the writer might thus define his geographical standpoint and that of his earlier readers.

The position in time assumed by the writer is equally obvious. He is writing of the antediluvian period and of a "garden" or district supposed to have existed in that period, but possibly not existing in his own time. The time of the writer is post-diluvian, but in that early post-

diluvian period referred to in the tenth chapter of Genesis, when the tribes noticed in the description were separating themselves and acquiring distinct territories. Thus we seem to have here a writer who professes to have written at the date referred to in the early genealogy of the sons of Noah in Genesis x., and on or near the Euphrates.

Let us suppose, for the sake of illustration, an old chronicler describing the invasion of Central Britain by the Romans, and remarking that the district is drained principally by four rivers. The first is the Severn, which flows westward toward the country of the West Saxons, where is much valuable tin and copper. The second is the Ouse, which flows eastward into the country of the East Angles, where is much marshy land. The third is the Trent, which flows toward the land of Deira. The fourth is the Thames. Might we not infer, first, that the writer was not contemporary with the Roman Conquest, but with the Saxon Heptarchy, to which his geography refers; and secondly, that his own position was in the south of England in the valley of the Thames. It might of course remain open to question whether the author of the chronicle really lived in the time and place indicated, or was of later date, and merely simulated an earlier date and a special locality. In either case, however, we should have a right to interpret his description in accordance with the indications afforded by himself.

Treating our ancient description in Genesis ii. in this way, we find that the writer professes to be describing a topography of more ancient date, in terms of his own later time, but that he believes that this topography can be ascertained and defined, at least in a general way, by existing physical and ethnical facts. Let us now examine more minutely what he actually says.

(1) The garden was to the eastward of his Euphratean standpoint. It was "eastward in Eden." It has, I know,

been proposed to read the word translated eastward as meaning before or beforehand, but this view is apparently strained, and I believe the general consent of scholars reads it as in both our English versions.

(2) It was in a country or district named "Eden," a word which has usually been held to signify a pleasant or beautiful country; but which Schrader, with reason, prefers to connect with the Chaldean *Idinu*, meaning plain country. In either case we should suppose that some part of the great fertile plain east of the Euphrates is intended, more especially when we connect with it the idea of irrigation, evidently implied in the sequel of the description.[1] It is to be observed, however, that in the antediluvian period this plain may have presented conditions considerably different from those of the time of the writer, and this may account for some of the peculiarities of his statements. We shall see the evidence of this farther on.

(3) It was at or near the confluence of the Euphrates and Tigris, and where these were joined by two other rivers presumably flowing from the east. It has been supposed that the heads of these rivers may be meant; but this seems to be a forced interpretation of the simple and clear topographical sentence, "From thence it was parted and became, or constituted, four heads."

(4) These rivers were known to the writer and his earlier readers, but in so imperfect a way that three of them required descriptive notes for their identification; and he begins with the most distant and least known stream, ending with that so well known as to need no characteristic.

These preliminaries being understood, let us now inquire as to the rivers intended, bearing in mind that they lie to the eastward of the Euphrates and become confluent with it near to each other. We may add that, as another of the rivers is well known and generally admitted to be the

[1] The rivers "watered" the garden.

Hiddekel or Tigris, we have to look for two rivers only, lying eastward of the latter and connected with it and with the Euphrates near their junction. The only rivers in this relation are the Kerkhar, the ancient Choaspes, and the Kuran, the ancient Pasitigris. We must however consider the characters given to the two rivers referred to by our ancient geographer.

The Pison, presumably the most eastern river, and whose name indicates a spreading or overflowing stream, is said to compass or pass through the whole land of Havilah, and to drain a country producing gold, bedolach, and the shoham stone, which must be local products, and probably products of a rocky or metamorphic country near the sources of the river. As to Havilah, there are two tribes designated by this name in the tenth chapter of Genesis. One of these is of Semitic descent, and of the family of Joktan; the other Hamitic, and of the line of Cush. No information is given of the latter in Genesis x., but there is a note respecting the Semitic Havilah which suggests a connexion with the present description. It is said of him and his brethren, that "their dwelling is from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the east." Sephar has been generally supposed by Biblical geographers to be a city and seaport in Arabia; but here it is said to be a mountain, and one lying to the east of the primitive abodes of man in Shinar, so that this identification can scarcely be correct. It is more likely to be the mountainous region affording the products we have just been considering, and perhaps connected with that later Sephar from which the Assyrian kings transported Sepharvaim to people the cities of Israel (2 Kings xvii. 24). In any case the reference of the name to Arabia implies a different geographical standpoint from that of the writer, either in the second or the tenth of Genesis, and is therefore not admissible, whatever facts may be afforded by

subsequent history as to Joktanite tribes in Arabia, to which they may have come in the great migrations of the Abrahamic age. Thus the Sephar of Genesis x. may well be those Luristan mountains which are the nearest east of Euphrates, and from which the river Kuran, a large and important stream, celebrated for the purity of its waters and the fertility of its banks, flows into the Shat-el-Arab or united Tigris and Euphrates. The early abodes of Havilah may have been along this river, and the people of this race may have been the first post-diluvian explorers of the mineral riches of these mountains, as their descendants perhaps afterwards were of the mountains of Eastern Arabia. But it will be well, before entering on the discussion of these questions, to inquire respecting the nature of the products referred to.

As to the gold, it is characterised as good. This raises the question of the distinction in the mind of the writer between good and inferior gold. In primitive times gold occurring in large nuggets, and therefore available for being worked by hammering, was more valuable than that in fine scales or dust; and gold in a state of absolute purity was more valuable than that alloyed with other metals. Again, native copper was sometimes regarded and used as an inferior kind of gold. In some one of these respects, or in all of them, the gold of Havilah was believed by the writer to be of superior quality. According to Loftus, gold occurs in the mountains of Luristan, drained by one of the tributaries of the Kuran, but as to its quality I have no information. This is, however, the nearest gold region to the plain of the Lower Euphrates.

Bedolach is rendered bdellium in our English versions, but it is scarcely likely that a vegetable product should be classed along with two minerals, and we should therefore be disposed to inquire if some stony or similar substance may not be intended. The word unfortunately occurs only

here and once in the Book of Numbers; but there are some considerations which aid us in ascertaining its nature. Its etymology indicates something picked out or separated, an indication leading to the idea of small objects obtained by selection from other material.[1] In the Book of Numbers the manna is compared to it, but in a special manner. The "eye," that is the lustre, of the manna is said to be like the "eye" of bedolach. Bedolach must therefore have been well known to the Hebrews of the Exodus as a substance occurring in rounded grains, and having a peculiar lustre. In accordance with these indications, the weight of ancient authority seems to be in favour of the pearl, a view strongly supported with a great weight of references by Bochart. In primitive times the pearl was valued, especially for necklaces; and as the use of language was not very critical in such matters, and the pearl, though of animal origin, is of stony hardness, it is probable that shell and stone applicable to the manufacture of beads would be bedolach as well as the proper pearl. In point of fact, in the oldest interments known, there are necklaces made of perforated shells and stones, and even of fossils.[2] Fresh-water pearls and pearly shells are found in many rivers, and the mountainous district already referred to affords various crystalline minerals and pure white gypsum, which might readily be associated with pearls or other material of personal ornament.

The stone shoham our old translators left in its original form without translation, while the Revised Version gives "onyx" in the text and "beryl" in the margin. This uncertainty is not wonderful, since even in the Septuagint, whose translators may be supposed to have known some-

[1] Our own word "bead" is apparently derived in the same way from a root signifying to count.

[2] In the Museum of Archæology, at Brussels, I have seen a beautiful necklace composed of 150 silicified *Turritellæ*, which is attributed to the "Mammoth Age," or in other words, to antediluvian times.

thing of the substance intended, it is rendered by five different words in the different places where it occurs. Still the testimony of the Septuagint, when interpreted mineralogically, has a definite significance. In the passage before us it is rendered *lithos prasinos*, prase-like or leek-green stone. In other places it appears as smaragdos, which among the Greeks was a general name for green ornamental stones, as emerald, malachite, serpentine, and jade. In two other places it is rendered by beryl, which is a variety of emerald. In the only other places, two in number, in which it occurs, it appears as onyx and sardius. In one of them (Job xxviii. 16) it is associated with the sapphire, which was certainly a blue stone, being compared to the sky, and in the other (Exod. xxxv. 8) the stone referred to in connexion with the priestly garments is evidently the same with that in Exod. xxxv. 27, where the Septuagint has smaragdos. The testimony of this ancient version is therefore in favour of some greenish stone, and we should here bear in mind that the names of precious stones were in ancient times based on their colour, independently of their composition. To this we may add that Schrader compares shoham with the Babylonian *Sanitu*, a valuable stone afforded by the mountains east of Babylonia, and supposed to have been of a dark colour. We may further note that an allied word in Arabic denotes a dart or arrow, connecting this stone with the material of weapons. It is also true that stones of greenish colour, as emerald, malachite, jade and turquoise, were held in high estimation in ancient times, and that a certain sacredness was attached to them. In Egypt such stones were sacred to Athor, the mother of men, and a similar superstition has extended into the east of Asia, and even into America. This respect for such stones would seem to be founded on the fact that jade or jadeite, and some allied green minerals, have commended them-

selves to primitive man in every part of the world, from New Zealand to Alaska and Siberia, as the best material for the manufacture of polished implements and weapons, and as the basis of one of the great steps in mechanical discovery in the primeval stone age.[1]

We may therefore without much hesitation consider this primitive list of minerals as carrying us back to an early period of eastern civilization, akin to that which in Europe has been termed the age of polished stone, and may read "gold, bedolach, and shoham," as signifying in that old time the native metals, the materials of beads or wampum, and of personal ornament, and the stone most useful for implements and weapons. In other words we may translate the words "gold, wampum, and jadeite," terms which in any primitive state of society would include all that is most precious in the mineral kingdom. We have now before us the question, in what region east of the Euphrates can these precious products be found?

Some information on this subject was obtained by Ainsworth, the geologist of the Euphrates expedition,[2] but much more full descriptions of the geology of this region have been given by the late William Kennett Loftus, of the Turco-Persian Frontier Commission,[3] a man equally distinguished as a geologist and archæologist. According to Loftus, the alluvial and marine plain east of the Tigris is bounded by a tertiary formation of gravel, sandstone, and

[1] The terms jade, nephrite, and jadeite have been applied to several silicates of magnesia, lime, and aluminium, distinguished usually by a more or less green colour derived from protoxide of iron, by a close texture admitting of a fine polish and of a sharp edge, and by considerable hardness and toughness, characters admirably adapting them for the manufacture of weapons and cutting instruments. The more highly coloured and translucent varieties are also well adapted for purposes of ornament. The use of these minerals in primitive times, and among rude peoples, has been almost universal, and in districts where they could not be obtained they have been articles of commerce.

[2] *Researches in Assyria*, etc., 1858.

[3] *Quarterly Journal of Geological Society*, vol. xi.

marl, containing large deposits of gypsum, which was extensively used by the Assyrians for architectural and ornamental purposes. In the gravels of these deposits are many pebbles, derived from the rocks next to be mentioned, and which might have been used in early times for the making of implements. The gypsiferous series forms low hills, succeeded to the eastward by a great formation of limestone, the nummulitic limestone of the Eocene Period, attaining in some places an elevation of 9,000 feet. Succeeding to these, after the intervention of lower beds referred to the Cretaceous and Palæozoic series, there occur in the mountains of Luristan clay slates and micaceous schists, with crystalline limestone, associated with which are granite and porphyry and various kinds of trap. In the streams traversing this older formation gold is found,[1] and there are precious garnets, beautiful green serpentine, and a hard dark green jade or a green chert. The important point for our present purpose is, that these metamorphic and crystalline rocks which form the highest hills of Eastern Persia, afford the products referred to in Genesis ii., and that this is the nearest district to the Euphrates in which these products occur. Further, the river Kuran, the ancient Pasitigris, originates in these hills, and is the only river of the region that does so, and it empties into the Shat-el-Arab, the stream which arises from the confluence of the Euphrates and Tigris. Thus we are able to find a river answering to the Pison of our old geographer, and which, while flowing from mountains rich in mineral products, is in its lower portion a spreading or overflowing river, watering one of the finest countries in the world, and on the banks of which was situated the city of Susa, the capital of ancient Persia, and the winter palace of its kings, celebrated for its beauty and the fertility of its en-

[1] In the Elwend Mountain, and probably in the head waters of the Diz, a branch of the Kuran.

virons. To the early dwellers in Mesopotamia the valley of the Kuran afforded fertile soil and scenic beauty, and by following it up they would reach the nearest district of metamorphic rocks and mineral riches.[1]

If the Pison of our narrative be the Kuran, then the second river, the Gihon, the rushing or rapid river, must be the Kerkhah, the ancient Choaspes, a river of considerable magnitude and importance, though inferior to the Tigris and Euphrates. This stream intervenes between the Kuran and the Tigris, and its head waters do not reach so far into the mountains as those of the former river. This is an important point, as in the ordinary maps of the district the reverse is the case; but on referring to the geological map prepared by Loftus from personal surveys, we find that it is really the Kuran that penetrates the metamorphic country, so that the topographical geology of Genesis is more accurate than that of most of the maps in our modern atlases.[2] The Gihon is said to compass the whole land of Cush, not an African or Arabian Cush, but that primitive Cush noticed in the tenth chapter of Genesis, and which under Nimrod founded the first Chaldean Empire in the plain of the Euphrates. If the Gihon compassed the Cushite territory, this early empire must have extended across the Tigris nearly to the foot hills of the Persian

[1] I have examined the collections of Loftus, which are in the museum of the Geological Society of London, and which fully bear out his description. The specimens, however, require microscopic examination, as it seems probable that some of those classed as hard green serpentine and green chert are really varieties of jadeite. Loftus says, "If a traveller approach the dominions of the Shah from the Persian Gulf or from lower Mesopotamia, he must cross the vast range of the ancient Zagros, and invariably meet with the part of the section exhibited in Fig. 1" (of his memoirs). This section, showing the rocks and minerals referred to in the text, is that which the earliest explorers would find as they wandered up the Kuran and its tributary the Diz, and which would introduce them to a region of mineral products quite different from anything to be found in the Euphratean plain.

[2] It is scarcely necessary to say that Loftus, in his explanations, had no special reference to the identification of the rivers of Eden.

mountains; but in this there is nothing improbable. The fact that Cush is said to have had a son named Havilah may, however, have some significance in this connexion. It is also interesting to note that the Kerkhah compassed the land of the Cossai of classical history, and flows through the modern Khuristan.

We thus find, if we place our ancient geographer where he places himself, and suppose that he refers to the Euphrates and the three principal rivers confluent with it near its entrance into the Persian Gulf, we obtain a clear idea of his meaning, and find that whatever the sources of his information respecting the antediluvian Eden, he had correct ideas of the Idinu of his own time, and of its surroundings and inhabitants. According to him, the primitive seat of man was in the south of the Babylonian plain, in an irrigated district of great fertility, and having in its vicinity mountain tracts abounding in such mineral products as were of use to primeval man. It is not my purpose here to vindicate the accuracy of his statements, but I may shortly refer to some questions that may arise concerning them.

It has been objected to the Babylonian site of Eden, that there is evidence that in Pleistocene times the Chaldean plain was under the sea, and that the encroachment of the alluvium on the head of the Persian Gulf is so rapid as to prove that in early historic times the Euphrates and Tigris were separate streams. But this objection neglects the fact that between the Pleistocene submergence of the country, and the modern period, there intervened that continental age in which all Europe and Western Asia were more elevated than at present, and the Babylonian plain must have been higher and less swampy than it now is, while it is probable that the mouths of the Kuran and Kerkhat were better defined and nearer to each other than they now are. It is probable that this time of continental elevation was that of antediluvian

man, and that consequently to which our writer refers. We must, therefore, in order to realize the exact geographical position of Eden, according to Genesis, imagine the shallower parts of the Persian Gulf to be dry land, the Shat-el-Arab to be longer than at present, and the country on its banks dry, though capable of irrigation, and clothed with open woods; while the climate would be more equable than at present. This was undoubtedly its condition in the early human period at the close of the Pleistocene, and must have been known to or imagined by the writer of the early chapters of Genesis. In Haeckel's curious map of the affiliation of mankind[1] he agrees so far with our ancient geographer, but stretches the primitive abode of man still farther to the south, over an imaginary continent of "Lemuria," supposed to be submerged under the Indian Ocean, but of whose existence Wallace had shown that there is no good evidence.

There is a curious biblical connexion between this district, and the earliest history of post-diluvian man. We are told the ark of Noah grounded on the mountains of Ararat, and that immediately after the deluge, the survivors moved southward and westward, and settled themselves in the plain of Shinar. This would be natural if to them Shinar or its vicinity was the site of Eden. Further, this post-diluvian migration from the hills of the north has fixed itself in the traditions of men, as Warren has argued in his ingenious but fanciful book, *Paradise Found*, in which he gives to the fact, contrary to the Bible history, an antediluvian bearing. Lenormant has illustrated this,[2] and has shown that the Chaldean, Persian, and Indian traditions, of the origin of man in northern mountains are really post-diluvian.

Another important question relates to the ideas of our ancient authority respecting the minerals he mentions.

[1] *Evolution of Man.* [2] *Ancient History of the East.*

Did he suppose that these were important to Edenic man, or are his notes respecting them intended merely to identify the river Pison? It would seem likely that the former is the true explanation. Just as he informs us that Eden contained every tree pleasant to the eye and good for fruit, so it would seem that he wishes to inform us that the "precious things of the lasting hills" were also accessible. Man, he tells us, was to dress the garden, and keep it, and even Adam may have required stone tools for this purpose, while there can be little doubt, that the fig leaves and dresses of skin would soon be followed by feminine attempts at ornament. It is further to be observed, that Cain is said to have fled to the east after the murder of his brother, and this would bring him to that mountainous country which contained the mineral treasures referred to, and of which, according to Genesis, his descendants so soon began to make use. Thus there is nothing contradictory in these ancient accounts, but the whole hang together with perfect consistency. They are also consistent with the curious Babylonian traditions, that Noah hid the documents of the antediluvian world at Sippara, a name probably connected with Sephar, and that he himself, or his spirit, still lingered at the mouth of the Euphrates, as if watching the slow retreat of those waters which in his time had overflowed the world.

Finally, the conclusions above reached are not very novel or startling, being near to those of Calvin and Bochart, and of Pressel in more modern times; and while they limit the geopraphical horizon of our ancient author, and do not imply that he had any information as to rivers so distant as the Oxus and the Indus, they serve to place the whole of the statements respecting early man in harmony with each other and with geographical facts, and to show that the documents embodied in these records are of great antiquity and historically accurate, unless

indeed we prefer to believe that their writer was a consummate master of the art of simulating antiquity, and wonderfully fortunate in anticipating discovery; or on the other hand, that he was supernaturally enlightened as to matters not otherwise known to him.

J. Wm. Dawson.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XXVI.

CLOSING MESSAGES.

"Salute the brethren that are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church that is in their house. And when this epistle hath been read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye also read the epistle from Laodicea. And say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it. The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand. Remember my bonds. Grace be with you."—Col. iv. 15–end (Rev. Ver.).

There is a marked love of triplets in these closing messages. There were three of the circumcision who desired to salute the Colossians; and there were three Gentiles whose greetings follow these. Now we have a triple message from the Apostle himself—his greeting to Laodicea, his message as to the interchange of letters with that Church, and his grave, stringent charge to Archippus. Finally, the letter closes with a few hurried words in his own handwriting, which also are threefold, and seem to have been added in extreme haste, and to be compressed to the utmost possible brevity.

I. We shall first look at the threefold greeting and warnings to Laodicea.

In the first part of this triple message we have a glimpse of the Christian life of that city. "Salute the brethren that are in Laodicea." These are, of course, the whole body of Christians in the neighbouring town, which was a

much more important place than Colossæ. They are the same persons as "the Church of the Laodiceans." Then comes a special greeting to "Nymphas," who was obviously a brother of some importance and influence in the Laodicean Church, though to us he has sunk to be an empty name. With him Paul salutes "the Church that is in *their* house" (Rev. Ver.). Whose house? Probably that belonging to Nymphas and his family. Perhaps that belonging to Nymphas and the Church that met in it, if these were other than his family. The more difficult expression is adopted by preponderating textual authorities, and "*his* house" is regarded as a correction to make the sense easier. If so, then the expression is one of which in our ignorance we have lost the key, and must be content to leave unexplained.

But what was this "Church in the house"? We read that Prisca and Aquila had such both in their house in Rome (Rom. xvi. 5) and in Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 19), and that Philemon had such in his house at Colossæ. It may be that only the household of Nymphas is meant, and that the words import no more than that it was a Christian household; or it may be, and more probably, that in all these cases there was some gathering of a few of the Christians in each place, who were more closely connected with the heads of the household, and met in their houses more or less regularly to worship and to help one another in the Christian life. We have no facts that decide which of these two suppositions is correct. The early Christians had, of course, no buildings especially used for their meetings, and there may often have been difficulty in finding suitable places, particularly in cities where the Church was numerous. It may have been customary, therefore, for brethren who had large and convenient houses, to gather together portions of the whole community in these. In any case, the expression gives us a glimpse of the primitive elasticity of

Church order, and of the early fluidity, so to speak, of ecclesiastical language. The word "Church" has not yet been hardened and fixed to its present technical sense. There was but one Church in Laodicea, and yet within it there was this little Church—an *imperium in imperio*—as if the word had not yet come to mean more than an assembly, and as if all arrangements of order and worship, and all the terminology of later days, were undreamed of yet. The life was there, but the forms which were to grow out of the life, and to protect it sometimes, and to stifle it often, were only beginning to show themselves, and were certainly not yet felt to be forms.

We may note, too, the beautiful glimpse we get here of domestic and social religion.

If the Church in the house of Nymphas consisted of his own family and dependants, it stands for us as a lesson of what every family, which has a Christian man or woman at its head, ought to be. Little knowledge of the ordering of so-called Christian households is needed to be sure that domestic religion is wofully neglected to-day. Family worship and family instruction are disused, one fears, in many homes, the heads of which can remember both in their father's house; and the unspoken aroma and atmosphere of religion does not fill the house with its odour, as it ought to do. If a Christian householder have not "a Church in his house," the family union is tending to become "a synagogue of Satan." One or other it is sure to be. It is a solemn question for all parents and heads of households, What am I doing to make my house a Church, my family a family united by faith in Jesus Christ?

A like suggestion may be made if, as is possible, the Church in the house of Nymphas included more than relatives and dependants. It is a miserable thing when social intercourse plays freely round every other subject, and taboos all mention of religion. It is a miserable thing when

Christian people choose and cultivate society for worldly advantages, business connexions, family advancement, and for every reason under heaven—sometimes a long way under—except those of a common faith, and the desire to increase it.

It is not needful to lay down extravagant, impracticable restrictions, by insisting either that we should limit our society to religious men, or our conversation to religious subjects. But it is a bad sign when our chosen associates are chosen for every other reason but their religion, and when our talk is copiously flowing on all other subjects, and becomes a constrained driblet when religion comes to be spoken of. Let us try to carry about with us an influence which shall permeate all our social intercourse, and make it, if not directly religious, yet never antagonistic to religion, and always capable of passing easily and naturally into the highest regions. Our godly forefathers used to carve texts over their house doors. Let us do the same in higher fashion, so that all who cross the threshold may feel that they have come into a Christian household, where cheerful godliness sweetens and brightens the sanctities of home.

We have next a remarkable direction as to the interchange of Paul's letters to Colossæ and Laodicea. The present Epistle is to be sent over to the neighbouring Church of Laodicea—that is quite clear. But what is "the Epistle from Laodicea" which the Colossians are to be sure to get and to read? The connexion forbids us to suppose that a letter written by the Laodicean Church is meant. Both letters are plainly Pauline epistles, and the latter is said to be "from Laodicea," simply because the Colossians were to procure it from that place. The "from" does not imply authorship, but transmission. What then has become of this letter? Is it lost? So say some commentators; but a more probable opinion is that it is no other than the Epistle which we know as that to the Ephesians. This is

not the occasion to enter on a discussion of that view. It will be enough to notice that very weighty textual authorities omit the words "in Ephesus," in the first verse of that Epistle. The conjecture is a very reasonable one, that the letter was intended for a circle of Churches, and had originally no place named in the superscription, just as we might issue circulars "To the Church in ——," leaving a blank to be filled in with different names. This conjecture is strengthened by the marked absence of personal references in the letter, which in that respect forms a striking contrast to the Epistle to the Colossians, which it so strongly resembles in other particulars. Probably, therefore, Tychicus had both letters put into his hands for delivery. The circular would go first to Ephesus as the most important Church in Asia, and thence would be carried by him to one community after another, till he reached Laodicea, from which he would come further up the valley to Colossæ, bringing both letters with him. The Colossians are not told to *get* the letter from Laodicea, but to be sure that they *read* it. Tychicus would see that it came to them; their business was to see that they marked, learned, and inwardly digested it.

The urgency of these instructions that Paul's letters should be read, reminds us of a similar but still more stringent injunction in his earliest epistle (1 Thess. v. 27), "I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." Is it possible that these Churches did not much care for Paul's words, and were more willing to admit that they were weighty and powerful, than to study them and lay them to heart? It looks almost like it. Perhaps they got the same treatment then as they often do now, and were more praised than read, even by those who professed to look upon him as their teacher in Christ!

But passing by that, we come to the last part of this threefold message, the solemn warning to a slothful servant.

"Say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it." A sharp message that—and especially sharp, as being sent through others, and not spoken directly to the man himself. If this Archippus were a member of the Church at Colossæ, it is remarkable that Paul should not have spoken to him directly, as he did to Euodia and Syntyche, the two good women at Philippi, who had fallen out. But it is by no means certain that he was. We find him named again, indeed, at the beginning of the Epistle to Philemon, in such immediate connexion with the latter, and with his wife Apphia, that he has been supposed to be their son. At all events, he was intimately associated with the Church in the house of Philemon, who, as we know, was a Colossian. The conclusion, therefore, seems at first sight most natural that Archippus too belonged to the Colossian Church. But on the other hand the difficulty already referred to seems to point in another direction; and if it be further remembered that this whole section is concerned with the Church at Laodicea, it will be seen to be a likely conclusion from all the facts that Archippus, though perhaps a native of Colossæ, or even a resident there, had his "ministry" in connexion with that other neighbouring Church.

It may be worth notice, in passing, that all these messages to Laodicea occurring here, strongly favour the supposition that the epistle from that place cannot have been a letter especially meant for them, as, if it had been, these would have naturally been inserted in it. So far, therefore, they confirm the hypothesis that it was a circular.

Some may say, Well, what in the world does it matter where Archippus worked? Not very much perhaps; and yet one cannot but read this grave exhortation to a man who was evidently getting languid and negligent, without remembering what we hear about Laodicea and the angel of the Church there, when next we meet it in the page of

Scripture. It is not impossible that Archippus was that very "angel," to whom the Lord Himself sent the message through His servant John, more awful than that which Paul had sent through his brethren at Colossæ, "Because thou art neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of My mouth."

Be that as it may, the message is for us all. Each of us has a "ministry," a sphere of service. We may either fill it full, with earnest devotion and patient heroism, as some expanding gas fills out the silken round of its containing vessel, or we may breathe into it only enough to occupy a little portion, while all the rest hangs empty and flaccid. We have to "fulfil our ministry."

A sacred motive enhances the obligation—we have received it "*in* the Lord." In union with Him it has been laid on us. No human hand has imposed it, nor does it arise merely from earthly relationships, but our fellowship with Jesus Christ, and incorporation into the true Vine, has laid on us responsibilities, and exalted us by service.

There must be diligent watchfulness in order to fulfil our ministry. We must take heed to our service, and we must take heed to ourselves. We have to reflect upon it, its extent, nature, imperativeness, upon the manner of discharging it, and the means of fitness for it. We have to keep our work ever before us. Unless we are absorbed in it, we shall not fulfil it. And we have to take heed to ourselves, ever feeling our weakness and the strong antagonisms in our own natures which hinder our discharge of the plainest, most imperative duties.

And let us remember, too, that if once we begin, like Archippus, to be a little languid and perfunctory in our work, we may end where the Church of Laodicea ended, whether he were its angel or no, with that nauseous lukewarmness which sickens even Christ's longsuffering love, and forces Him to reject it with loathing.

II. And now we come to the end of our task, and have to consider the hasty last words in Paul's own hand.

We can see him taking the reed from the amanuensis and adding the three brief sentences which close the letter. He first writes that which is equivalent to our modern usage of signing the letter—"the salutation of me Paul with mine own hand." This appears to have been his usual practice, or, as he says in 2 Thess. (iii. 17), it was "his token in every epistle"—the evidence that it was the genuine expression of his mind. Probably his weak eyesight, which appears certain, may have had something to do with his employment of a secretary, as we may assume him to have done, even when there is no express mention of his autograph in the closing salutations. We find for example in the Epistle to the Romans no words corresponding to these, but the modest amanuensis steps for a moment into the light near the end: "I Tertius, who write the epistle, salute you in the Lord."

The endorsement with his name is followed by a request singularly pathetic in its abrupt brevity. "Remember my bonds." This is the one personal reference in the letter, unless we add as a second, his request for their prayers that he may speak the mystery of Christ, for which he is in bonds. There is a striking contrast in this respect with the abundant allusions to his circumstances in the Epistle to the Philippians, which also belongs to the period of his captivity. He had been swept far away from thoughts of self by the enthusiasm of his subject. The vision that opened before him of his Lord in His glory, the Lord of Creation, the Head of the Church, the throned helper of every trusting soul, had flooded his chamber with light and swept guards and chains and restrictions out of his consciousness. But now the spell is broken, and common things re-assert their power. He stretches out his hand for the reed to write his last words, and as he does so, the

chain which fastens him to the Prætorian guard at his side pulls and hinders him. He wakes to the consciousness of his prison. The seer, swept along by the storm wind of a Divine inspiration, is gone. The weak man remains. The exhaustion after such an hour of high communion makes him more than usually dependent; and all his subtle profound teachings, all his thunderings and lightnings, end in the simple cry, which goes straight to the heart: "Remember my bonds."

He wished their remembrance because he needed their *sympathy*. Like the old rags which were put round the ropes by which the prophet was hauled out of his dungeon, the poorest bit of sympathy twisted round a fetter makes it chafe less. The petition helps us to conceive how heavy a trial Paul felt his imprisonment, little as he said about it, and bravely as he bore it. He wished their remembrance too, because his bonds added weight to his words. His sufferings gave him a right to speak. In times of persecution confessors are the highest teachers, and the marks of the Lord Jesus borne in a man's body give more authority than diplomas and learning.

He wished their remembrance because his bonds might encourage them to stedfast endurance if need for it should arise. He points to his own sufferings, and would have them take heart to bear their lighter crosses and to fight their easier battle.

One cannot but recall the words of Paul's Master, so like these in sound, so unlike them in deepest meaning. Can there be a greater contrast than between "Remember my bonds," the plaintive appeal of a weak man seeking sympathy, coming as an appendix, quite apart from the subject of the letter, and "Do this in remembrance of Me," the royal words of the Master? Why is the memory of Christ's death so unlike the memory of Paul's chains? Why is the one merely for the play of sympathy, and the enforcement of

his teaching, and the other the very centre of our religion? For one reason alone. Because Christ's death is the life of the world, and Paul's sufferings, whatever their worth, had nothing in them that bore, except indirectly, on man's redemption. "Was Paul crucified for you?" We remember his chains, and they give him sacredness in our eyes. But we remember the broken body and shed blood of our Lord, and cleave to it in faith as the one sacrifice for the world's sin.

And then comes the last word: "Grace be with you." The Apostolic benediction, with which he closes all his letters, occurs in many different stages of expression. Here it is pared down to the very quick. No shorter form is possible—and yet even in this condition of extreme compression, all good is in it.

All possible blessing is wrapped up in that one word, Grace. Like the sunshine, it carries life and fruitfulness in itself. If the favour and kindness of God, flowing out to men so far beneath Him, who deserve such different treatment, be ours, then in our hearts will be rest and a great peacefulness, whatever may be about us, and in our characters will be all beauties and capacities, in the measure of our possession of that grace.

That all-productive germ of joy and excellence is here parted among the whole body of Colossian Christians. The dew of this benediction falls upon them all—the teachers of error if they still held by Christ, the Judaisers, the slothful Archippus, even as the grace which it invokes will pour itself into imperfect natures and adorn very sinful characters, if beneath the imperfection and the evil there be the true affiance of the soul on Christ.

That communication of grace to a sinful world is the end of all God's deeds, as it is the end of this letter. That great revelation which began when man began, which has spoken its complete message in the Son, the heir of all

things, as this Epistle tells us, has this for the purpose of all its words—whether they are terrible or gentle, deep or simple—that God's grace may dwell among men. The mystery of Christ's being, the agony of Christ's cross, the hidden glories of Christ's dominion are all for this end, that of His fulness we may all receive, and grace for grace. The Old Testament, true to its genius, ends with stern onward-looking words which point to a future coming of the Lord and to the possible terrible aspect of that coming—"Lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." It is the last echo of the long drawn blast of the trumpets of Sinai. The New Testament ends, as our Epistle ends, and as we believe the weary history of the world will end, with the benediction: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all."

That grace, the love which pardons and quickens and makes good and fair and wise and strong, is offered to all in Christ. Unless we have accepted it, God's revelation and Christ's work have failed as far as we are concerned. "We therefore, as fellow-workers with Him, beseech you that ye receive not the grace of God in vain."

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

DR. SANDAY ON THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

I THINK we must all be grateful to Dr. Sanday for having undertaken the somewhat delicate task of reviewing the progress which has been made in recent years towards a more correct understanding of the constitution of the primitive Church; and if it be true that the greatest difficulty of all Church historians lies in the manner in which we project our own ecclesiastical selves and our environments, with the proper amount of idealization, upon the mists of

that obscure period which we call the first century, then we shall be obliged to conclude that Dr. Sanday has been remarkably successful in his brief review. We have, for our part, been up the mountain of Research as many times as we ever desire, the object of the ascent being to see a Brocken-spectre; but if, on the other hand, an eminent scholar will show us, instead of a reflection of the institutions of to-day or yesterday, the real directions in which the mists divide, and where a prospect can be obtained through the rifts of the lost city of God, we are ready to climb with him all day long. Such is the task which I understand Dr. Sanday to have undertaken. He proposes to us to find the first foundations for a *textus receptus* of Church history; in which we may be sure that the preliminary work will be found provocative of much questioning, both on account of the omitted and inserted portions of the text. And it will be observed, just as in the familiar New Testament problem from which we borrow our illustration, that the omissions are more productive of irritation than the additions. It is no slight humiliation to be told that the metal which your spectroscope noted in a star was in reality an unsuspected part of your own atmosphere. Something like this however is what all modern investigations in Church history have been leading us to for a long time past; and Dr. Sanday is right in emphasising the convergence of independent investigations alongside of the continuity which is restored by the recovery of missing documents to the broken framework of the Christian records. Theology has its missing links as well as natural science; and that too although, as Dr. Sanday points out, the progress of the Church has been from a condition of greater illumination to one more defective. Certainly no more striking instance has ever occurred than the recovered *Doctrine of the Apostles*. It spans not one gulf, but many; it has bridged the chasm between the Synagogue and the

Church, between the Presbyterate and the Episcopate, between the Jew and the Christian, and between the Christian and the Montanist. And we must be content (even though we might not *à priori* have expected to be grateful), that so much light may come to us in a single flash.

Now with regard to the questions proposed by Dr. Sanday, I understand it to be agreed, as far as possible, to set aside such points as turn upon the early or late date of a given author, and conceive the situation as expressed by the accepted Christian literature. It makes comparatively little difference to the first stage of the problems whether the Epistle to Titus be an authentic Pauline production or not. The same is true of the Ignatian Epistles; for whenever they were written, the possible interval is sufficiently circumscribed, and either the purpose for which they were composed or the result which they achieved (put it which way you like) is sufficiently patent. And although criticism may seem to disarm itself unduly by keeping questions of date and authorship as far as possible in the background, yet in reality the surrender acts on both sides of the question as far as sides exist. No one, for example, ought to acknowledge the genuineness of the third epistle of John, with its unmeasured railing at the man who loves the primacy, and hold that the monarchical episcopate was of apostolic authority; he might indeed maintain the antiquity of the office, but not its apostolicity, and so it is hardly likely that a mistake will be made in working from the conclusions generally current as to the early Christian literature. As a matter of fact, I believe the thesis could be maintained that the whole body of that literature has become more intelligibly homogeneous since the recovery of the *Teaching of the Apostles:* how far that little candle sheds its beams!

Turning then to the question of the origin of the episcopate, may we not say first, with regard to the *office* of

the *episcopos*, that since the two companion terms, presbyter and deacon, date from Jewish soil and involve Jewish ideas, that it is *à priori* likely that there is a Jewish base for the episcopal office. If, as I suppose, the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, which is one of our first authorities for bishops and deacons, is in the main Jewish or Judæo-Christian (and all the investigation tends that way), then we have another indication of the same view. I am not speaking of the *name*, but of the *office*. Too much weight can hardly be assigned to Dr. Hatch's theory (or rather demonstration) of the difference between the synagogue and its associated Sanhedrin: the point is one which, in modern days, is hard to realize, when the Church has lost all legislative functions, or all except some that attach themselves still to the shadow of a great name. We do not grasp the fact that the early dream of a new social order involved *law* as well as *gospel:* that the Church contemplated a political isolation of its members as well as a moral, and that the new religion was almost more of a theocracy than the old. At all events, the primitive Christian did not suppose himself less able to find a solution of a civil case with his fellow in the assembly which had been transferred from Moses to Christ, than he had been able to obtain under the earlier organization, for both were similar in structure and they were equal in simplicity. The presbyters certainly did not limit themselves to participation in a consecrated eating and drinking, not to say to the attendance upon prayer or prophecy-meetings. We see this clearly in Paul's reproof to the Corinthians, in which he deplores the absence among them of the "wise man" who formed a part of the Jewish court of justice and sat on the right hand of its president. Now if this be so, as I think it will be found to be, then the *episcopos* in his earlier form will probably be found to belong to the local court that attaches itself to every primitive Christian assembly. But

lest there should be any doubt that such functions really were exercised, we turn to the *Teaching of the Apostles*, and there find the very thing that we speak of in its most pronounced form. For we are told that a person who sins against the community by taking from another member money for which he has no real need, is to be brought under examination, and if he cannot make his innocence good is to be cast into prison until he pay the uttermost farthing. Do we suppose that this means a Roman prison or a Jewish trial? Is it likely that either Roman or Jewish ruler would concern himself with charges of this kind? It follows then, that sins against the new Society were punishable—at least, in early times and in more Eastern localities—by the Society itself. The conclusion is a strange one, but not therefore incorrect: we do not easily realize the simplicity, both of the structure of Eastern society or its reconstruction by the Gospel. Mohammedanism affords instructive parallels. As soon as we see this, we get a ray or two of light upon the qualifications of the episcopal office. It is not hard, for example, to explain why the bishop must be a husband of one wife, when we know that a similar regulation held with regard to the Sanhedrin of the Jews.

Nor is it without importance (as Dr. Hatch has noted, p. 62) that we find an analogy in the number of Church officers (a bishop and two presbyters) assigned to smaller communities, and the number which is necessary to constitute a proper official assembly in Jewish towns of less than a certain population. And this identification becomes more clear if we observe that the Jews actually discussed the question whether the Shekinah was with the three persons who constituted the minimum *beth-din*, or house of judgment, in the same way as it was promised to the assembly at large. The following note from Dr. Taylor's *Pirke Aboth*, p. 61, will explain the point: "R. Eliezer ben Jacob

said . . . Hence they have said, Every ten men that are assembled in the synagogue, the Shekinah is with them, for it is said, God standeth in the *'edah* (congregation), etc. And whence even three that JUDGE, because it is said, He judges among gods," etc. It is granted that the Shekinah is with an *ἐκκλησία*, a congregation assembled for the discharge of religious duties; but is the Shekinah present likewise at secular functions? Yes! Where three are gathered to administer justice, the Shekinah is in the midst. It appears therefore, that the *ἐπίσκοπος* and the *πρεσβύτερος* are forms whose origin is purely secular. And this at once reduces almost to zero the statement of Dr. Sanday, that the share which the bishops and deacons had in the Church was in the services, and particularly in the eucharist: "For," says he, "the regulations in regard to these are immediately followed by instructions as to the appointment of bishops and deacons, Appoint therefore," etc. A little consideration will, I think, show that the passage does not refer to Church ceremonial at all, but to the exclusion from the assembly of persons who were at variance with one another; and this disciplinary exclusion belongs, of course, to the bishops and their inferior officers.

But it may be asked, Is there any evidence at all to connect the *name* of bishop with the exercise of administrative functions of the character described? The nearest evidence that I can give will be found in the passage of Strabo which Josephus quotes in *Ant.* xiv., vii. 2, where the local administrator of the Jewish colony in Alexandria is said to distribute justice and supervise contracts (*συμβολαίων ἐπιμελεῖται*). Is it too much to say that the official thus described was an *ἐπιμελητής*, especially in view of the passage (1 Tim. iii. 5) where the bishop is said to have the care (*ἐπιμελήσεται*) of the Church of God?

The foregoing view is also confirmed by the laying on of

hands, which the Jews practised with rabbis and *judges*, signifying thereby "*an association, an approximation so conjoyning of one into the same corporation or company of which he that doth associate and give admission is a member.*" [1]

I have gone into these points somewhat at length because it seemed necessary to point out that Dr. Hatch's theory is not to be limited to the view that the bishop is a financial officer only, and hence derives his name. As to the particular point whether the Greek municipality furnished the name or not, I have no sufficiently clear conviction to wish to express myself. Nor do I know in what manner the bishops are elected from amongst the presbyters, nor whether their position is originally a permanent one, or the contrary.

Turning now to the latter part of Dr. Sanday's criticism, namely, that which relates to the original existence of superior orders, now lost, in the Church, I find myself in almost complete agreement with him and Prof. Harnack. As he says, "We are almost driven to the conclusion." I take that to imply that we might have reached the point without over much driving. We ought to have seen it without the discovery of the *Teaching of the Apostles*. The few surviving notes which we have with regard to the Montanists would have told us the whole story, if we had been willing to read them, without the prejudice and persistent misunderstanding which we have inherited from the Church of the second century. Even now, with the master key in his hand, Dr. Sanday does not seem to see that the only legitimate conclusion from his admissions is that Montanism was primitive Christianity. Judged by no standard accessible to us, will any other result come to the front? Was the early Church chiliastic as the *Didache* triumphantly proves? So was Montanism. Was it based upon the pre-eminence of inspired persons who owed their election

[1] Godwyn: *Moses and Aaron*, p. 215.

to no human hands? We have in Montanism the apostle and the prophet surviving either under their own names, or under the modification of patriarchs and kenones (*κοινωνοί*). Was the exercise of prophecy in the early Church an asexual gift, as the New Testament represents it to be? It was so in Montanism, and was admitted to have had a primitive foundation by their opponents. It was allowed by the Catholic critics that Montanism was only a heresy from the side of discipline; namely, that they degraded the bishop to the third rank. We know now that this is only another way of expressing the fact that the Catholics *raised* the *episcopos* from a position *not higher than third* in the new social and official scale. Dr. Sanday is right when he says that Montanus represented himself to be "not the end of a descent, but the climax of an ascent from the day of Pentecost"; but he would have at once invalidated his assumption if there had been any discontinuity in his Church offices as compared with early times. And when Dr. Sanday goes on to say "there was an *element* of conservatism in it," he seems to me to altogether understate the case, and to take his key out of the lock and throw it back again into the swamp from which a good genius had fetched it. Granted that Montanism had an element of reaction in it, yet it differs from the commoner forms of reaction in this, that whereas in many, or in most cases, reaction is like the impact of a ball against a hard wall, which flies off in a direction almost as oblique as its incidence, in Montanism the primitive Church momentum was met by the obstructing influences precisely at right angles, and thus has a reaction in the very same direction as its motion. If anything therefore were to be expected, it would be that the primitive traits of Montanistic Christianity would be more pronounced than in the foundation of the religion, but that this was almost entirely prevented by the wisdom of the leaders of the movement, although it may be sceptically

received by some, through their singular modesty; and this is shown by the fact that when the Catholic Christians reviled the Montanists for their presumption in attributing to themselves the graces of antiquity, they had to bring forward such trivial charges as that one of the leaders had ventured to write a catholic epistle in the apostolic manner, a thing no longer to be tolerated. Sound in morals (for no one now believes the ridiculous and contradictory scandals with which they were besmeared), and pure in faith (for even the Catholics admitted their orthodoxy), inspired in utterance and expression (perhaps even to a fault), their only error is found in discipline; *that is, in their continuity with primitive times.* It is no reproach to them that, in their desire to save the Church, they themselves became cast away on the rocks of the new organization. St. Paul might have suffered the same if he had been the junior of Ignatius instead of his predecessor.

But to return to the evolution of the *episcopos:* it seems to me that Prof. Sanday does not emphasise sufficiently the fact that the change which we now know to have taken place in the Church order was resolutely contested both before, during, and after the time of Montanus. We see traces of this strife in the *Epistle of Clement*, as well as in the heats of Ignatius. The Johannean epistles show the new dignitary in strife with the elder. The *Apostolic Constitutions* prove to us that the terms used in earlier records of the prophetic gift are transferred to the episcopal (I notice to-day a fresh passage under this head, which I do not remember to have seen pointed out, viz. *Ap. Const.* ii. 45, *οὗτοι γὰρ ὑμῶν εἰσιν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς*, which is carried over directly from the *Teaching of the Apostles*): the same incipient antagonism is implied in the warning given in the *Teaching* against condemning prophets, or criticising their utterances; the words, "ye shall not judge," imply presbyteral functions, and we know that a similar function was in fact exercised

by the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem (the only Jewish council, I believe, which had the right to condemn a prophet).

In the *Shepherd of Hermas* the opposition is between the bishop and the presbyterate, or rather between the bishop and the πλήθος, who are warned to defend the presbyterate; while, coming down to later times, the Montanistic *Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas* show us the bishop in opposition to the *illuminati* generally, who furnish him with a reproof for not prohibiting his flock from the attendance at the games in the arena, which again points to administrative and judicial functions. These are indications of something more than a spasmodic fretfulness under necessary changes.

But this throws us back again upon the previous point, Were these changes necessary? We can see that the Montanists were not a sect in any sense of the word; the multitudinous nicknames attached to them (Priscillianists, Maximillites, Taxodugites, Artotyrites, and the like) prove that a sect with so many names is no sect at all. Why then was it necessary that the *ecclesia Spiritus* should have been boycotted by the *ecclesia episcoporum?*

"It was necessary perhaps for the preservation of Christianity," says Dr. Sanday. "The centrifugal tendencies of the Church were so strong." But surely, if Montanism is anything, it is a centripetal tendency (for even an extravagant worship of the Holy Ghost has its reward), and the way to abolish the centrifugal can hardly be the disallowance of the centripetal. Would it not be better boldly to face the position, and say that we find in the Church as elsewhere that the folly of man enters as a factor along with the wisdom of God. The spiritual kingdom is as liable to *coup d'état* usurpation, and other imperial ills, as if it had been a merely temporal sovereignty.

While therefore I am intensely thankful to Dr. Sanday for the thoughtful and just manner in which he has pre-

sented the difficult problems of early Church life, and agree almost entirely with his critical conclusions, I regret extremely that he should have expressed himself to the effect that it was necessary for the "splendid dawn of Spirit-given illumination" to "fade into the light of common day." Dr. Sanday will remember in this connexion the preface to the *Acts of Perpetua*, in which we find it stated that "we reverence, even as we do the prophecies, modern visions promised to us, and consider the other powers of the Holy Ghost as an agency of the Church to which He was sent, administering all gifts to all, even as the Lord distributed to every one, that so no weakness or despondency of faith may suppose that the Divine grace abode only in the ancients, whether as regards the condescension that raised up martyrs, or that which gave revelations."

J. Rendel Harris.

RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

For some little time back there has been a cessation of hostilities between the camps of faith and unbelief. Sallies, "excursions and alarums," there have of course been; but these have been rather the skirmishing of outposts, or the sham-fights needful to maintain efficiency, than serious and critical warfare. Christianity has perhaps more to fear at present from Socialism than from the criticism of its documents by the Epigoni of the Tübingen school, or from the supercilious confidence of the followers of the Zeitgeist, or the earnest one-sidedness of science. An entirely new departure in attack would indeed be a windfall to the Christian apologist. And yet conscientious and thorough grappling with the ordinary problems reminds us that much remains to be done before we can look for the universal acceptance of fundamental truths. Dr. Bruce, in his volume on the *Miraculous Element in the Gospels*,[1]

[1] *The Miraculous Element in the Gospels.* By A. B. Bruce, D.D., Prof. of Apologetics, Free Ch. Coll., Glasgow. (Hodder and Stoughton.)

goes over ground that has been much trodden, but leaves the distinctive impress of the original thinker. He does not tread in other men's steps, even when travelling on the same road with them, but carries forward the discussion on miracles into a healthier atmosphere, and brings to bear on many vexed questions a weight of candid and substantial reasoning which most readers will feel to be final. As a contribution to Apologetics, Dr. Bruce's work is of the very highest value, whether we judge it by the importance of its subject or the breadth and rationality of its treatment, by the candour and courage with which real difficulties are met, by the patience and thoroughness and fine spirit displayed throughout, or by the crispness, ease, and vigour of the style. We venture to say that those who have spent most thought on miracles will find in this volume many fresh and fruitful suggestions, and will discover a new charm in ground they have often traversed before. The secret however of the charm and success of Dr. Bruce's volume lies in the circumstance that his method is that of the investigator, and not of the apologist. He disposes of objections to the miraculous, not so much by counter-argument, as by more fully disclosing the real nature of the miraculous, and by throwing light on its connexion with the whole of Christ's work. It is essentially a constructive and positive, and not merely a polemical book. And accordingly Strauss, Renan, and some critics of even larger mould, are again and again, and quite unintentionally, made to look as foolish as a man who has been hanging in the dark by his hands from a seven-foot wall looks when the morning breaks, making extreme difficulty where really there is none.

Dr. Bruce's book is also opportune. By anticipation it has answered Dr. Abbott's very clever and stimulating, but most unsatisfying, *Kernel and Husk*.[1] The felicity of expression which appears in the title charms the reader in every chapter. But let no one who stumbles at the miraculous think that Dr. Abbott has found a better way for him. To become a disciple of Dr. Abbott we must believe that Jesus is the incarnate Word of God, we must worship Him, we must accept the miracles of healing (though we need not any longer call them "miracles"), we must believe that while on earth He could forgive sins and predict future events,

[1] *The Kernel and the Husk: Letters on Spiritual Christianity.* By the author of *Philochristus.* (Macmillan & Co.)

and that now He is in heaven He can answer prayer. There may possibly be one or two peculiarly constituted minds who find Dr. Abbott's position tenable, and his suggestions a relief to their sceptical anxieties; but most men will feel that they are asked to swallow the camel among whose hair the gnat of physical miracle would slide down unobserved. He grants that "it was necessary that the incarnate Word should manifest God's creative power as well as His love and righteousness." But this was accomplished by Christ becoming a life-giving Spirit to mankind. He is so fanaticized against physical miracle that he even occasionally mis-states the question. For example, on p. 115, he says: "Here at last we can come to an understanding. You look up to God as the Maker of the world, and are more ready to worship Him as such than to worship a non-miraculous Christ." But the positing of these as alternative beliefs is a serious distortion of the real issue. To accept the miraculous is not to worship physical marvels in preference to moral marvels, or to be drawn by what is material rather than by what is spiritual. It is only to acknowledge that the source of life and power in the material world is the same as in the spiritual. We do not more readily worship the Maker of the world than the loving and righteous and Divine Christ, but we more readily worship that Person who combines in Himself spiritual and physical supremacy.

Dr. Abbott cannot be accused of habitually underrating the difficulties of his position. On the contrary, he usually states them with admirable lucidity and force. He clearly apprehends that by accepting Jesus as Himself a moral miracle, he lays himself open to a charge of inconsistency. The manner in which he meets this charge is the weakest, as it ought to be the strongest, part of his book. His answer is: "We see in the best of men approximations to sinlessness, but no approximations at all to what spiritualists (I believe) call 'levitation.'" Approximations to levity, if not to levitation, we are fated to find where we least expect it. But this treatment of the core of the whole subject shows how much need there still is for such an exposition of the nature of miracles, and of their congruity with the work and character of Christ, as Dr. Bruce has given us. Dr. Bruce indeed says, "Believers could part with the physical miracles of the Gospels if science or exegesis demanded the sacrifice." Perhaps in making this concession he forgot his own just observation,

"From denial of the value of facts to the denial of the facts themselves there is but a step." Perhaps it betrays that even Dr. Bruce, who has certainly shown the reasonableness and congruity of the Gospel miracles with more convincing force than any previous writer, does not yet so distinctly discern their place and function as to see that they are essential. But this hypothetical concession is made after he has proved that neither science nor exegesis demand the sacrifice; and it would be unfair to build upon it any serious conclusions.

While then there is much that is wise and much that is brilliant in Dr. Abbott's book, it is Dr. Bruce's we should prefer to put into the hands of any one who is stumbled by the miraculous element in the gospels. Under his skilful and trenchant treatment the miracles are freed from the excrescences with which hasty thinkers and too eager apologists have covered them, and they stand out once more as constituent and important elements in the revelation made by Christ. Their evidential function is minimised; and perhaps Dr. Bruce sometimes neglects to consider that a miracle which is not wrought *for the sake of* affording evidence may on that account be all the stronger evidence. But the footing on which he places the gospel miracles, as the utterance of Christ's love and as the impressive exhibition in act of the doctrine He taught, cannot but be most helpful to many minds. The perusal of his volume proves the truth of his own words: "To abandon, as antiquated, the artificial views of apologists as to the uses of the gospel miracles may be right and proper, but the miracles themselves can never be wisely treated as of little, or at most of only subordinate moment."

That sermons should form so large a proportion of current literature can seem surprising only to one who does not consider that a preacher can "play upon every stop" in human nature and stir interest and emotion as effectually as poet or novelist, if he has the will and the power to do so. A natural orator can find no better opportunity than the pulpit gives him. Mr. Brooks is not an orator in the highest sense of the term, but he has the faculty of rivetting the attention of an audience and moving it to high ends. The volume of sermons[1] he has just published in this country is worthy of a place on the same shelf as those of Dean

[1] *Twenty Sermons.* By Phillips Brooks, Rector of Trinity Church Boston. (Macmillan & Co., 1886.)

Church or Stopford Brooke. They do not pioneer for us as the sermons of Frederick Robertson did; they do not lay foundations for belief and conduct as those epoch-making sermons did: but in lucidity and grace they are comparable to them. If not so intense in their earnestness, they are yet intensely earnest; and if not so crisp and sparkling in their style, they have yet the merit of pure and admirable English. Persons and their various experiences have greater attraction for Mr. Brooks than themes or articles of faith. Life, its joys, its hopes, its difficulties and sorrows, are his favourite subjects, and these are treated with a sympathetic and wise touch. There is no lack of strength in the volume, but fineness is the most obvious characteristic of the sermons. The ideas are never commonplace, and the spirit that breathes through the whole is tender and pitiful, full of hope and reverence. The significance which Mr. Brooks sees in baptism is very different from that which doctrinal theology requires or from that which Philip the Evangelist seems to have perceived.

An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.[1] This little book admirably fulfils the intention of the series to which it belongs, and justifies the claim of that series to be entitled "The Theological Educator." Professor Warfield is known on both sides of the Atlantic as an authority on all questions connected with New Testament scholarship; but nothing he has previously done gives a clearer idea of his mastery of facts and power of exposition. Even the professed student will find in this little volume an easier and more convincing introduction to a clear knowledge of the genealogical method than in Dr. Hort's own exposition. To bring it into use in colleges as a perfect text-book of the subject, a greater fulness of detail might in some of the chapters be desired; but as a masterly survey of the whole subject, in which details are so handled as to assist our clearer perception of the whole, nothing better can be desired or looked for. A book so full of information, so well-reasoned, so brightly written, has never before been put in the hands of theological students.

[1] *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.* By Rev. Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., Professor of New Testament Criticism, Alleghany, U.S.A. (Hodder and Stoughton, 1886.)

MARCUS DODS.

To the Editor of "The Expositor."

Sir,—

In your notice of Canon Westcott, stress is laid on his pointing *The Paragraph Psalter*, whereas the preface distinctly states that the pointing is taken from *The Pointed Prayer Book*. Dr. Westcott's work has been, as he says, "to exhibit the general structure of the Psalms in such a manner as to suggest the variety of musical treatment which is required in different Psalms, and the different parts of the same Psalms, for their interpretation"; while, as to the musician's part, he adds, "no nobler task can be given to the religious artist than to interpret the Psalms in a universal language."

Yours faithfully,

Stephen Phillips,

Reader and Chaplain of Gray's Inn,
and late Precentor of Peterborough Cathedral.

SOME LESSONS OF THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

II. Exactness in Grammatical Details.

1. So far I have noticed some examples of the necessary shortcomings of an English version of the Greek Testament. Let me now point to some typical changes, in which the Revised Version has been able to convey to the English reader more of the exact force and colouring of the original than he could see before.

2. This is not the place to discuss the peculiarities of the Greek of the New Testament. It must be enough to recognise the fact that it is marked by unique characteristics. It is separated very clearly, both in general vocabulary and in construction, from the language of the LXX., the Greek Version of the Old Testament, which was its preparation, and from the Greek of the Fathers, which was its development. It combines the simple directness of Hebrew thought with the precision of Greek expression. In this way the subtle delicacy of Greek expression in some sense interprets Hebrew thought.

At the same time the several writers and the constituent books of the New Testament present individual features. The first three Gospels differ in style from the fourth; the Epistle to the Galatians differs from that to the Ephesians; and both differ from the Epistle to the Hebrews.

3. A faithful translation will therefore endeavour to preserve even minute traits which are characteristic either in construction or in vocabulary. In biblical Greek, for example, the quality of an object is often expressed by the

genitive of a substantive, in imitation of the Hebrew idiom ("the steward of unrighteousness," *i.e.* "the unrighteous steward," Luke xvi. 8); but in many cases it is a most serious loss to represent this vivid and suggestive form of expression by an adjectival rendering. Every one will feel that to substitute (as in A.V.) *gracious words* for *words of grace* in Luke iv. 22; *true holiness* for *holiness of truth* (I should have preferred *of the truth*, "the holiness which is the practical embodiment of Christianity") in Eph. iv. 24; *godly sincerity* for *sincerity of God* (followed by the *grace of God*) in 2 Cor. i. 12; *His mighty angels* for *the angels of His power* in 2 Thess. i. 7 (followed by *the glory of His might*); *His dear Son* for *the Son of His love* in Col. i. 13, is to obscure the truth. The last phrase, indeed, is an enrichment of English Scriptural language which cannot fail to pass into common use. In one familiar passage the injury was greater. Abp. Whately, in his last illness, begged a friend to read to him St. Paul's description of the Christian's hope, as he looks "*for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ*," "*who shall change* (so the friend read from A.V.) *our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body.*" "No, no," interrupted the archbishop; "give his own words. He never called God's work vile." And so now we read, "*who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory*" (Phil. iii. 21).

One characteristic thought of the Bible, suggested by this last passage, has been placed clearly before the English reader by the preservation of this idiom. The revelation of the manifold perfection of God, as man can apprehend it, is for us "the glory of God." "The glory of God" is that which we are enabled to see in Him, and not something which we bring of our own to Him. As we ponder this truth we come to understand what is meant by *the gospel of the glory of the blessed God* (1 Tim. i. 11); *the light of the*

Gospel of the glory of Christ (2 Cor. iv. 4); *the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ* (Tit. ii. 13); *strengthened with all power, according to the might of His glory* (Col. i. 11); *the liberty of the glory of the children of God* (Rom. viii. 21).

In place of a vague epithet we find that the symbolical appearances of "the glory of the Lord" in the Old Testament (comp. Exod. xxiv. 16) have obtained their fulfilment in the manifestation of God in Christ, who is "the image of the invisible God" (Col. i. 15); and in Him we look forward with wondering hope to the destiny of the creature made by His counsel of love, that he might attain His likeness.

4. The illustration which has been just given is taken from the common features of New Testament Greek. The several writers have also, as I have said, their distinguishing peculiarities. Sometimes a single word produces a striking effect in a book. Thus the student of the Greek of St. Mark's Gospel cannot fail to observe the singular frequency with which the Evangelist uses the adverb εὐθέως (εὐθύς). The word might be adequately rendered "*forthwith*," "*immediately*," "*straightway*," "*anon*"; and so it was variously rendered in the A.V. But obviously the fidelity of the translation was distinctly injured by the loss of the recurrent word; and so εὐθέως has been represented (I think) uniformly in the R.V. of the Gospel by its most exact equivalent, "*straightway*." The effect of the repetition of the adverb, which occurs about forty times in the Gospel—more times than in all the other books of the New Testament together—may be pleasing or unpleasing to a literary taste; but the translation conveys to the English reader exactly the same impression as the original conveyed to a Greek.

St. John, again, uses most commonly for his connecting particle a word (οὖν) which might be rendered "*therefore*," "*so*," "*then*"; and which was in fact represented in A.V.

by these words, and also by "*but*, "*now*," "*and*." But such variety of rendering necessarily tends to obscure the sense of the dependence of events one on another, of that inner sequence of life, which St. John specially points out.[1] If therefore the English reader is struck in the R.V. by this constantly repeated "*therefore*" in the fourth Gospel, he is naturally led by the monotonous ringing of the word to ponder one of its deepest lessons.

The reality of this lesson of the deep-lying relation of things is illustrated by another characteristic word of St. John's Gospel, which may be noticed here by anticipation. St. John habitually speaks of the Lord's mighty works as "*signs*." The teaching which he suggests is neutralized when, as in A.V., the original term is rendered three times more often "*miracles*" than "*signs*," and that too in places where the preservation of the same rendering throughout is of moment for the understanding of the argument (*e.g.* ii. 18, 23; vi. 26, 30). Step by step the "signs" are laid open in the Gospel, luminous with spiritual meaning; and when the reader has followed the use of the word throughout the narrative, he can first understand the language in which the Evangelist reviews the Lord's life at the end, as it stands in A.V.: "*Many other signs did Jesus in the presence of His disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*" . . . (John xx. 30*f*).[2]

5. Such slight but consistent changes as these, which preserve peculiarities of structure and language, affect the character of the translation of a whole book. If each case of change were considered separately the necessity of change might reasonably be questioned, but a wider view

[1] The "then" often appears as merely temporal; *e.g.* xii. 28. In John xi. 12, 14, we have οὖν and τότε, both rendered *then* in A.V.

[2] It will be noticed that the phrase "did signs," which has caused a good deal of confident criticism on the Revisers' English, is found here in A.V.

discloses the necessity; and the combination of small changes often brings light and harmony into difficult sections, both of the narrative and of the argument. Let any one, for example, note all the changes which have been made in the translation of the following passages, passages which are very different in character, and he will feel, unless I am mistaken, how much is gained in force and clearness by the whole effect of the revision: Matt. xxviii. 18–20; Mark viii. 23–26; Acts xxvii.; 1 Cor. xi. 20–34; 2 Cor. iv. 7–10; Col. iii. 1–4.

To examine these passages in detail here would be impossible. It would occupy all the space at our disposal. But an examination of two verses, not chosen for any special purpose, will indicate the points which require attention if a student desires to learn the lessons which the Revision is fitted to convey. For the meaning of a change is by no means obvious without the exercise of patient and sympathetic thought. And it is on this that I wish particularly to lay stress. The criticisms on the R.V. which I have seen have not been deficient in vigour, in confidence, in subtlety, in learning; but they have been singularly deficient in considerate intelligence. The patient use of a concordance would have answered many of them. And in graver variations nothing is easier than to criticise one aspect of a novel phrase. But the phrases of Scripture are many-sided; and a hasty or superficial critic is in danger of missing more than he observes. At least, let me repeat, the critic of the R.V. should remember that each change which he is called to consider is not the irresponsible opinion of a single scholar, but a judgment supported by an overwhelming majority of representative scholars after keen discussion. Their work then deserves to be examined at least in the same spirit with which it was done. No labour was spared in forming the judgment which has to be reviewed. The reader who condemns the conclusion

should be sure that he has taken pains to understand why it was deliberately adopted.

We may take then Luke xxii. 55 *f* as an average example of the revision where the changes have been numerous.[1] The changes of reading in the Greek text do not affect the rendering: the vivid περιαψάντων of the original could only be represented by a paraphrase. We notice then the following changes:

(1) *hall: court* (comp. Mark xiv. 66).

(2) *were set down, Peter sat down: had sat down, Peter sat.*

(3) *among: in the midst of.*

(4) *but: and.*

(5) *beheld . . . and earnestly looked . . . and said: seeing . . . and looking steadfastly . . . said.*

(6) *by the fire: in the light of the fire.*

(7) *was also: also was.*

Now of these changes (3) and (7) are perhaps in themselves of little moment, but they represent the original more closely than A.V., and are in agreement with it elsewhere (ἐν μέσῳ, Matt. xviii. 20; Luke xxiv. 36).

The variation in the conjunction (4) must be taken in connexion with the rendering of *v.* 57. The same particle (δέ) is used in the original in both verses; and it appears that the structure of the narrative is best represented by giving to it a conjunctive force in *v.* 56 and a disjunctive force in *v.* 57, while A.V. gives the opposite view.

In (2) the original gives two verbs, which are distinguished in R.V. "When they had all sat down Peter sat (was sitting) . . ." Our attention is directed to St. Peter as he formed one of the group, and not as joining it afterwards or separately.

The R.V. gives in (5) the natural progress of the incident, which is disturbed by the inaccurate introduction of the

[1] The student may take Luke vi. 48 as another instructive example.

strong word beheld in A.V. (ἰδοῦσα). The two other changes are essential to a true reproduction of the picture. It is essential that the reader should feel that the scene is in the open air; in the courtyard (αὐλῇ), not the covered hall; and the vivid touch (δ) "*in the light* of the fire" comes directly from the experience of some spectator. It is just one of those touches which assures us that we have the record of an eye-witness. We seem to see again the light falling on the troubled face of the anxious apostle, while A.V. gives us only a general phrase wholly inadequate to the Greek.

All the changes then, I believe, fully justify themselves when they are studied; but without study much of their meaning would be missed. An impatient reader might easily dismiss them with the verdict of "trivial" or "pedantic," and lose a lesson in the vivid power of the Gospel narrative.

6. Having made these general remarks, I wish now to notice examples of some classes of change, of which the student of the R.V. will take account. And in the first place I wish to give some representative illustrations of changes due to exactness of grammatical rendering, to a strict observance (*a*) of the force of tenses, (*b*) of the article, (*c*) of prepositions, and (*d*) of particles. A reader who has once felt the nature of the gain, most real if minute, which is thus secured will not afterwards be content to dismiss changes of a like kind without patient questioning.

(*a*) I have already spoken (*Introduction*, § 20) of the marvellous expressiveness of the tenses of the Greek verb, which often baffles the translator. The Revision has at least done much to help the English reader to appreciate this subtle power. A few simple instances will bring out the vividness of the *present*.

Thus in Matt. x. 12, the perfectly indefinite statement,

when ye come into a house, salute it, becomes instinct with life and movement by strict adherence to the original, *as ye enter into the house, salute it.* The benediction is part of the entrance (comp. Rom. xvi. 17, *are causing*). In John xiv. 18 (as elsewhere) the Lord says, *I come to you*, not, *I will come to you.* His Advent, if it is in one sense future, is in another sense continuous. So again in the prospect of his imminent death, St. Paul says (2 Tim. iv. 6), not, *I am ready to be offered*, but, *I am already being offered.* The sacrifice has begun, of which the apostle's sufferings were a part. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (and this is an important detail in relation to the date of the epistle) the ministrations of the Temple (representing those of the Tabernacle) are shown as present and not (as in A.V.) as past (Heb. ix. 6 *f*).[1]

7. A single word, though it happens that the form is irregular, will illustrate the force of the *imperfect.* St. John, in describing the attitude of the Baptist after Christ had returned from the Temptation, brings up before the reader his personal recollection of the scene. *On the next day*, he writes, *John was standing*, waiting in watchful ex-

[1] The student will find other instructive examples in
Matt. xviii. 12, which *goeth astray.*
,, xxvii. 24, that a tumult *was arising.*
Mark i. 37, all *are seeking* Thee.
,, x. 17, *as He was going* forth.
Luke ii. 40, marg., *becoming full of* wisdom.
John iv. 1, *was making and baptizing.*
,, xv. 27, ye also *bear* (not shall bear) witness.
,, xvi. 15, He *taketh.*
1 John ii. 8, the darkness *is passing* away.
1 Cor. i. 18 (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 10; Acts ii. 47, etc.), *are perishing . . . are being saved . . .*
,, ii. 6, *are coming* to nought.
Col. iii. 10, *is being renewed.*
1 Thess. i. 10, which *delivereth.*
,, v. 3, when they *are saying.*
These renderings may indeed appear to be wanting in elegance, but there can be no doubt as to the importance of the truths, before observed, which some of them bring home to the English reader.

pectation for the issue (i. 35; εἱστήκει, not *stood*, as in A.V.). And in six other passages of his Gospel in which he uses the word, there is the same pictured distinctness of the figure to which the eyes of many were turned. On the great day of the Feast of Tabernacles, Jesus *was standing*, till at last the silence was broken, *and He cried* . . . (vii. 37; εἱστήκει . . . καὶ ἔκραξε). At the betrayal, Judas *was standing* with the enemies of Christ (xviii. 5). St. Peter *was standing* at the door, when Jesus had entered the palace of the high priest (xviii. 16, comp. 18). By the cross of Jesus *were standing His mother and His mother's sister* . . . (xix. 25). When the disciples had returned from the empty tomb Mary *was standing* there still (xx. 11). In all these places A.V. has "*stood*," for which R.V. has substituted the strict rendering, except in vii. 37, where the combination "was standing, and he cried" seemed unhappily (I think) to many too harsh. The detail is perhaps a small one; but still is it not just the master-touch which kindles each scene with life?[1]

8. The force of the *aorist*, which answers, in the main, to the simple past tense in English, will come before us in other connexions. One or two examples will direct the English reader to consider the effect which it has in giving precision to a fact or thought.

When the wise men ask, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews? for we *saw* (εἴδομεν) His star in the east," they

[1] The following examples are all of interest:
Matt. xxiv. 1, Jesus went out, . . . and *was going on His way.*
Luke ii. 33, *were marvelling.*
„ xxiv. 32, *was not* our heart *burning?*
John iv. 30, they . . . *were coming* to Him.
„ vi. 18, the sea *was rising.*
„ x. 23, Jesus *was walking.*
Acts xxvii. 41, *began to break up.*
Comp. Mark ii. 23; ix. 9; John x. 40; xi. 8, 31; Acts iii. 1; vi. 1; xiii. 42; xvi. 25; 1 John ii. 26.
The student will feel in every case that the narrative gains in directness and life by the exact rendering.

place their conviction of the Divine birth in immediate connexion with a sign which had been granted to them. So the unfaithful disciples appeal to a past which rises sharply before them when they say, "Lord, Lord, *did we not prophesy* by Thy name, and by Thy name *cast* out devils?" (Matt. vii. 22.) The period of the instruction of Theophilus is clearly marked by the words, " . . . the certainty concerning the things wherein thou *wast* instructed" (Luke i. 4). The experience of Israel is vividly brought out in the R.V. of Acts vii. 52 *f*; John vi. 49. We are carried also to higher thoughts. The issue of the Divine counsel is placed in closer relation to the eternal order when we read, "for the elect's sake, whom He *chose*, He *shortened* the days" (Mark xiii. 20; comp. John xvii. 2; Eph. i. 4, 6, 8, 11). There is again, as it were, a glimpse of the court of heaven opened to us (Job i. 6 *ff*) when the Lord says, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan *asked* to have you: . . . but I *made supplication* for thee . . . " (Luke xxii. 31 *f*).[1]

The distinctive sense of the aorist is shown with marked emphasis when it is in close combination with other tenses. In many cases, as we have already seen (*Introduction*, § 20), the expressiveness of the connexion of the aorist and the imperfect cannot be reproduced directly in English, though sometimes it may be indicated by a fuller rendering of the imperfect (Acts iii. 8, he stood, and *began to walk*), or by the introduction of a pronoun which separates the two verbs and gives special distinctness to the second action (*e.g.* Acts xi. 23; xv. 12).[2]

When, on the other hand, the aorist is joined with the perfect, the force of the combination can generally be

[1] The student should pay particular attention to the use of the aorist in the Lord's last discourses in St. John (*e.g.* John xiii. 31, marg.; xvii. 4, 26).

[2] In addition to the passages already quoted, the following are worthy of study in the original: Matt. iv. 11; viii. 15; ix. 6; xxi. 8; Luke vii. 38; xviii. 38 *f*; Acts xv. 19 *f*; xvi. 7; Jas. ii. 22; 1 Cor. x. 4.

expressed. It will be enough to refer to one or two typical passages.

Thus in the beginning of his first epistle St. John distinguishes between the abiding evidence of sight to the message of the Gospel and that peculiar experience which he had himself had in the historical Presence of the Lord: "That which we have seen with our eyes, that which we *beheld*, and our hands *handled* . . . " (1 John i. 1). There is a corresponding distinction in the beginning of his gospel between the fact of creation and the continuance of created things: "All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that *hath been made*" (John i. 3; compare the rendering in the margin). The same contrast is found in Colossians i. 16, "in Him were all things created (*ἐκτίσθη*); . . . all things *have been created* (*ἔκτισται*) through Him, and unto Him."

9. The Greek *perfect* can generally be adequately represented in English, and it was, in fact, for the most part rightly rendered in A.V. (*e.g.* John xx. 21). But the exact meaning of some passages has been first given in R.V. The affirmation of the continuous virtue of the Resurrection, as shown by the remarkable language of 1 Cor. xv., has been already noticed, and the same abiding power belongs to the other facts of the historic life of Christ (Heb. ii. 9, 18; iv. 14, 15; xii. 3). In Matthew v. 10 blessedness is assigned to those who have borne the trial of persecution successfully, and not to those who are suffering in the conflict (contrast 1 Cor. iv. 12). The crown of righteousness is kept for those who *have loved* the Lord's appearing to the end (2 Tim. iv. 8). So too the words and the facts of Scripture are not infrequently presented in their abiding force, "that which hath been spoken" (Acts ii. 16; Heb. i. 13; iv. 3 *ff*; x. 9, etc.; Acts vii. 35; Heb. xi. 17 marg.); and the labours of earlier toilers for God are regarded not merely in the past, but as bearing fruit in the present (John iv. 38).

In one famous verse of St. John's Gospel the tense is not without bearing on the authorship of the Gospel. We read in A.V. of chap. xix. 35, *he that saw it bare record, and his record is true.* "What words," I remember to have read, "could show more clearly that the Evangelist quotes an earlier witness, who has passed away? If it were not so he must have used the perfect." And so indeed he did. What he wrote is rightly translated, *he that hath seen hath borne witness;* and the force of the argument is turned in the opposite direction.[1]

10. (*b*) The definite article is a second most important element in the power of Greek. This fared badly in the A.V., for the Latin versions, which greatly influenced our early translators, even when they were unconscious of the influence, were incapable of expressing it. Thus it came to pass that the definite article was both wrongly introduced in A.V., and also wrongly omitted.

A few examples of each kind of error, which have been corrected in the revision, will direct the English reader to details which constantly require his attention.

11. It has been frequently urged against St. Paul that he is guilty of exaggeration in stating *that the love of money is the root of all evil* (1 Tim. vi. 10). But in point of fact what he does say is that *the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil:* it possesses this evil power, but does not monopolise it,—a truth which finds daily illustration. The same apostle again, when he describes the privileges of his office, insists on its character and not on its exclusive and exhaustive endowment; *let a man so account of us, as of ministers of Christ*—not *the ministers* (1 Cor. iv. 1). The words which Moses received from God were not *the lively oracles,* but *living oracles* (Acts vii. 38). St. Stephen, in

[1] Other instructive examples of the exact rendering of the perfect are found: Matt. xix. 8; John i. 32*f*; vi. 69; ix. 29; xi. 27; xii. 29; xvii. 6; 1 Cor. xiii. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 9; Gal. iii. 19. Comp. Matt. i. 22; John i. 15.

using the phrase, wished to emphasise the power and not the completeness of the revelation. The wonder of the disciples when they saw the Lord conversing by the well at Sychar was not that He *was speaking with the woman*, but that He *was speaking with a woman* (John iv. 27; comp. Luke ii. 12; Acts iv. 9, xiv. 27). The teaching of the parable of the pounds is changed in an essential particular if we read that the nobleman *called his ten servants*, his whole household, instead of *called ten servants of his* (Luke xix. 13). This special charge is not presented as universal. The altar which the Athenians erected was not, as we are tempted to suppose, to one whose supreme and mysterious majesty they recognised (*the unknown God*), but simply to *an unknown god* (Acts xvii. 23). When the Lord delivered the address recorded in Luke vi., He stood not *in the plain*, but on *a level place*, a plateau on "the mountain" (*v.* 17).

In many cases the effect of the absence of the definite article is not felt without a moment's reflection; but then it will appear that the change has rightly thrown the emphasis on the character of the subject instead of the concrete subject itself. The English reader will appreciate the shade of difference between *the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans*, and *Jews have no dealings with Samaritans* (John iv. 9; comp. Acts xviii. 4; 1 Cor. i. 22).[1] Our thoughts are rightly guarded when we read, *Know ye not that ye are a temple of God?* (1 Cor. iii. 16;) *Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?* (1 Cor. vi. 15.) The Divine Sanctuary and the Divine Body is vaster and more complex than we can yet comprehend.

Sometimes the idea involved in the indefinite form is of more considerable importance. In Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14, the whole conception is destroyed by the use of the definite title *the Son of man;* and, as it seems to me, the loss is no

[1] Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 4; iii. 5; Rev. xiv. 6. The indefinite rendering in Matt. xii. 41 and Luke xi. 31*f*, would, I think, have been a gain.

less in John v. 27, though here the two-thirds majority was not obtained to change the text; but it will be observed that the American Revisers adopt the margin absolutely (comp. Heb. i. 2).[1] In all three cases the peculiar phrase of the original, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, marks true humanity and not the representative man. (Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 5, *Himself man.*)

In 1 Tim. iii. 11, the wrong introduction of the article (*their wives*) is a serious error in another direction. It has wholly removed the probable allusion to deaconesses, side by side with deacons.[2]

12. These illustrations will show the general effect of omission of the article in R.V. in accordance with the original, where it had been wrongly inserted in A.V. On the other hand, the introduction of the definite article into the R.V. in places where it had been wrongly omitted in A.V. frequently gives a local distinctness to a phrase which is vividly marked in the original. Thus whatever may be the meaning of *the pinnacle of the Temple* (Matt. iv. 5), it is no longer left in its misleading indefiniteness. In the narrative of the Gadarene demoniacs, *the steep* (Matt. viii. 32) gives back the touch which had disappeared in the A.V. (*a steep place*). *The mountain* is restored to its proper place in the familiar scenery of the Galilean lake (Matt. v. 1, xiv. 23, etc.) like "the wilderness" (Matt. iv. 1). The libe-

[1] In some cases, like this, it were to be wished that the Revisers had boldly adopted an anarthrous form in English (*Son*, not *a Son*, or *his Son*). John x. 2, *shepherd of the sheep* (not *the* or *a shepherd*); 1 Cor. xii. 27, *Christ's body;* John xii. 36, *as light* (not *a light*). (Comp. *Introduction*, § 22.)

[2] In some cases the power of association was too strong to allow the disturbance of a familiar phrase. Every reader will feel, upon reflection, the difference between "a living God" and "the living God," between the conceptions of the One Sovereign Father, regarded in His character and regarded in His personality. But the definite form remains in Heb. iii. 12; ix. 14; x. 31; xii. 22; 1 Tim. iv. 10; Acts xiv. 15, though in every case the argument gains by the strict rendering (see 1 Thess. i. 9). Here and there however the Revisers ventured to use a new form: *e.g.* Rom. i. 17; iii. 21, *a righteousness.* (Comp. *Introduction*, § 21.)

rality of the centurion at Capernaum is seen as it was described, *himself built us our synagogue* (Luke vii. 5). *The band of soldiers* (not *a band*), in John xviii. 3, at once suggests the thought of the Roman garrison of Antonia.

In other places the definiteness fixes attention on some custom or fact which might otherwise be overlooked. The question which St. Peter was over-hasty to answer becomes intelligible in its full import when we read: *Doth not your Master pay the half-shekel?*—the contribution of the faithful Jew to the Temple (Matt. xvii. 24, 27; Exod. xxx. 15). If at first hearing *the seats of them that sold the doves* (Matt. xxi. 12) sounds harsh, the pointed reference to the common offering of the poor is more than a compensation (comp. Luke ii. 16, *the manger;* Mark iv. 38, *the cushion*). The phrase, *how shall he . . . say the Amen at thy giving of thanks . . . ?* (1 Cor. xiv. 16; comp. 2 Cor. i. 20) gives a glimpse of the early Christian service. St. John nowhere mentions the call of the apostles, but in due course he refers to *the twelve* (vi. 70, *did not I choose you the twelve?*) as a well-known body. (Comp. Acts ii. 42, xx. 11, *the bread.*)

Sometimes the definite article calls up a familiar image. Thus the Baptist is not spoken of vaguely as *a burning and shining light,* but *the lamp that burneth and shineth* (John v. 35), the lamp which is used before the sun has risen, and which is consumed while it illuminates. *The bushel* and *the lamp-stand* (Matt. v. 15) are a part of the furniture of every cottage (comp. John xiii. 5, *the basin*). "The dogs" and "the swine" (Matt. vii. 6) are placed side by side as repulsive objects, which men were likely to encounter. The wise builder digs down till he reaches *the rock* (Matt. vii. 24; comp. xiii. 5, 7, 8), which underlies the superficial soil. A vision is opened to us of the inner harmonies of nature when we read that the fig tree has *her parable* for our instruction (Matt. xxiv. 32).

In this connexion it is of interest to notice how the language used of the coming of Christ and the last things has received again in the R.V. the vividness with which it had been coloured by the popular imagination. *The great tribulation* (Rev. vii. 14), *the weeping and gnashing of teeth* (Matt. viii. 12, etc.), *the crown of righteousness* (2 Tim. iv. 8) are living and familiar figures, under which the common belief was embodied (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 5; 1 Tim. i. 18; ii. 6; 2 John 7).

In close relation with this definite, popular imagery stand other phrases which express current spiritual conceptions in a concrete form, as "the light" and "the darkness" (John iii. 19), "the wretched one" (Rev. iii. 17; comp. Luke xviii. 13 marg.).

Sometimes classes are separated by the repetition of the article where the distinction is of importance to the sense. Thus the vengeance of the Lord is revealed (R.V.) *to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord.* Two kinds of offenders are contemplated, and not two offences of one class (A.V.). Yet once again the Greek article is able also to mark the gender of words which are themselves ambiguous. Thus when the A.V. says that Herod *slew all the children that were in Bethlehem*, the original (and R.V.) limits his violence to *the male children* (comp. John i. 11.)[1]

13. (*c*) It would not be possible to give even the most meagre series of representative examples to illustrate the shades of meaning in prepositions and particles, disregarded

[1] Every page of the R.V. will furnish examples of changes such as have been illustrated in the last two sections. The reader is apt to disregard them, and even to feel irritated by them, till he is induced to ask what is their exact force. Any one who will carefully compare (to take one passage), 1 Tim. vi. in R.V. and A.V. will, I think, feel that such details are not unimportant. Other isolated examples of interest occur: Matt. i. 23 (*the virgin*); Luke xvii. 17 (*the ten*); John xvi. 12 (*all the truth*); Acts i. 13 (*the upper room*); Acts iv. 11 (*you the builders*); Rom. v. 15 (*the many*); 1 Cor. i. 21 (*the preaching*); 1 Cor. x. 13 (*the way of escape*); Col. i. 19 (*all the fulness*).

in earlier versions, which have obtained an adequate expression in the R.V. Half a dozen passages will be enough to show the kind of changes which have been brought in by faithfulness in these details, and to give a clue which the reader can follow in his private study.

Two alterations of this class, each of a single syllable, are sufficient to illuminate our whole conception of the Christian faith. How few readers of A.V. could enter into the meaning of the baptismal formula, the charter of our life; but now, when we reflect on the words, *make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into* (not *in*) *the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost* (Matt. xxviii. 19), we come to know what is the mystery of our incorporation into the Body of Christ. And as we learn this we enter into St. Paul's words, *The free gift of God is eternal life in* (not *through*) *Christ Jesus our Lord* (Rom. vi. 23). It is indeed most true that the Son of God won life for us, but it is not anything apart from Himself. We live, as He has made it possible for us to realize life, only in Him (comp. John xx. 31; 1 Cor. i. 4; Eph. iv. 32; Phil. iv. 19). Am I then wrong in saying that he who has mastered the meaning of those two prepositions now truly rendered—"*into* the Name," "*in* Christ"—has found the central truth of Christianity? Certainly I would gladly have given the ten years of my life spent on the Revision to bring only these two phrases of the New Testament to the heart of Englishmen.

The other examples which I have set down are necessarily of less significance, but still they mark thoughts or traits in the apostolic writings not without interest. We can all feel the difference between "believing a man," and "believing in," or "on him." The first marks intellectual assent, and the second active devotion. The preservation of this contrast, lost in A.V., explains the tragic development of the history in John viii. Some *believed on* Christ (*v.* 30),

and they were safe in their readiness to follow Him, wherever He might lead them. Some *Jews believed Him* (*v.* 31), and, while they admitted His claims, would have made Him the Messiah of their own hearts. In such a state lay the possibility of the fatal issues of the chapter.[1]

In John xix. 24 *f*, the pathos of the description is grievously marred by the separation of the two groups at the cross which the Evangelist closely connects. *These things therefore the soldiers did. Now there stood* . . . (A.V.) Once again we feel the real meaning of the contrast by the help of a slight change in accordance with the original: *These things therefore the soldiers did. But there were standing* . . .

In the familiar sentence, *Let your light so shine before men that* . . . (Matt. v. 16), it is perhaps hardly possible to separate the "so" from that which follows, as if it were descriptive of the aim of Christian conduct (*so* . . . *that* . . .); but R.V. has done something to restore the true connexion: *Even so let your light shine* . . . as the lamp, placed in its proper and conspicuous position. The Christian must not shrink from the responsibility of faith.

A last illustration shall be taken from the form of a question. In Greek, even more simply than in English, the questioner can indicate the nature of the expected answer, and so reveal his own thoughts. When therefore we read now in John iv. 29, *Can this be the Christ?* we feel that the woman gives utterance to a thought which, she implies, is too great for hope. Her words grammatically suggest that it cannot be so, but faith lives still. (Comp. John xviii. 25, *μή*; vii. 26, *μή*; Luke xxiii. 39, *οὐχί*.)

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT.

[1] The student will find the variation of the prepositions in 1 Cor. xii. 7 *ff* (*though, according to, in*) a suggestive lesson in the laws of revelation.

NOTES ON DIFFICULT TEXTS.

2 Kings xv. 10. "And Shallum the son of Jabesh conspired against him (*i.e.* Zechariah), and smote him before the people, and slew him, and reigned in his stead." The verse reads innocently enough in the English: but the Hebrew scholar does not require to have pointed out to him the extraordinary style of the expression rendered *before the people*, קִבֵּל־עָם. Why the Aramaic word קבל, which occurs besides only in the avowedly Aramaic sections of Daniel and Ezra? why עם without the article? No such usage occurs throughout the Old Testament. Ewald, following the rendering of LXX., took *Qoboľām* as a proper name ("and Qoboľām smote him, and slew him," etc., *History*, iv. 154), supposing the allusion to be to a usurper, who obtained power for but a short time, and is not therefore further mentioned. But the name comes in very abruptly, and interrupts the connexion (for only Shallum is spoken of in *vv.* 13–15), and is not satisfactorily accounted for, even by the theory that it may have been originally merely a note written upon the margin. *Κεβλαὰμ* of the LXX. does not count for much; for in this version a word which the translators did not understand is very frequently transliterated: examples in this very book are, for instance, *ἀφφώ*, ii. 14, x. 10; *Βαιθακάθ*, x.12; *σαδημώθ*, xxiii. 4; *Χωμαρίμ*, *ib.* 5; so *Νεεσσαράν*, 1 Sam. xxi. 7; *Ῥηχάβ*, Jud. i. 19, and many others. All difficulty is removed by the brilliant conjecture of Grätz,[1] which has been accepted by Stade,[2] בִּיבְלְעָם *in Ibleam* for קבל־עם. The change of letters is as slight as possible; and as Stade points out, it is the custom of the narrator in similar cases to indicate the locality of the occurrence, *vv.* 14, 25; 1 Kings xv. 27, xvi. 9; 2 Kings xii. 20 [21 Heb.]. Ibleam lay in the plain of Jezreel (Josh. xvii. 11; 2 Kings

[1] *Gesch. der Juden*, II. i. p. 99. [2] *Gesch. des V. Israels*, p. 575.

ix. 27), where Hosea (i. 5) actually anticipated the fall of Jehu's dynasty, and the ruin of Israel; but the coincidence is probably accidental, for the prophet pictures to himself a *military* disaster ("I will break the *bow* of Israel in the valley of Jezreel"), which he imagines as enacted on the great "battle-field of Palestine," which had also been the scene of Jehu's triumph, while the historian apparently describes an assassination at the hand of a body of conspirators.

Hos. xiii. 9. שִׁחֶתְךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי־בִי בְעֶזְרֶךָ; A.V. "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me *is* thy help." This rendering of A.V. is derived, in the first part of the verse, from the mediæval Jewish scholar Rashi (d. 1104) who paraphrases חבלת עצמך ישראל; in the second part, from David Kimchi (כי בי היה עזרך). That it is not tenable is clear: (1) שִׁחֶתְךָ cannot, even paraphrastically, be rendered "thou hast destroyed thyself"; (2) כִּי has the force of *but* only after a negative ("they have not rejected thee, *for* me they have rejected," i.e. "*but* me they have rejected"); (3) בעזרך, with the prep. ב, cannot denote the subject of the last clause. שִׁחֶתְךָ is the 3 pers. of a verb; and the subject must be either (1) something inferred from the context, as the calf mentioned above (so Kimchi), or (2) the indeterminate pronoun *One*—or, to speak more accurately, in accordance with Semitic usage, the cognate participle הַמְשַׁחֵת;[1] or (3) the sentence in clause *b*, "that, etc." Clause *b*, now, if the text be sound, can only be understood

[1] In such a sentence as ויאמר ליוסף Gen. xlviii. 1, or על־כן קרא לבאר, *ib.* xvi. 14, the true subject of the verb is not the indefinite *one* (Germ. *man*, Fr. *on*), but the cognate participle ויאמר האומר, על כן קרא הקורא, which is sometimes actually expressed, as Deut. xxii. 8, כי יפול הנופל ממנו, when *he that falleth* shall fall from it; 2 Sam. xvii. 9, ושמע השומע; Isa. xxviii. 4, אשר יראה הראה אותה, which *he that seeth it* shall see. Comp. Ibn Ezra on Isa. viii. 4, and often (Friedländer, *Essays on Ibn Ezra*, p. 134, *note* 5), Kimchi on 1 Ki. xxii. 38 (וישטף השוטף, *sc.*), Prof. Cheyne, critical note on Isa. xiv. 30, etc.; and for Arabic, Dr. Wright, *Arab. Gr.*, ii. § 132. The explanation of the idiom in Ges., *Gr.* § 137, 3, is not adequate.

by the assumption of an ellipse: "that (thou art) against me, against thy help" (R.V.: so in effect already Rashi כי בי פשעת מרדת בעזרך, "for against me hast thou transgressed, (and) rebelled against thy help"). Combining (3) with this, we obtain the rendering, "It hath destroyed thee, O Israel, that (thou art) against me, against thy help," which is that of Ewald, Hitzig, Nowack, and the R.V. Adopting the construction (2), and for the sake of English idiom transforming "He that destroyeth hath destroyed thee," into the passive "Thou art destroyed," we obtain the rendering of R.V. *marg.*, "Thou art destroyed, O Israel; for (thou art) against me, against thy help," which, so far as concerns the first clause, is quite grammatical, though not, perhaps, altogether so forcible as the former alternative. Still, with either of these constructions, the ellipse—or aposiopesis—in clause *b* is strange and unusual; and the preposition ב without some verb (such as is added in the paraphrase of Rashi) denoting explicitly the idea of opposition or rebellion, does not naturally express *against*. The LXX. for the last two words have *τίς βοηθήσει*: the Peshitto similarly ܡܢ ܢܟܝܢ *who* will help thee? This points to a reading מִי *who?* for בִּי "against me": "Thou art destroyed, O Israel: for *who is there as thy help?*" and affords a sense in thorough harmony with the context. Jehovah, *v.* 8 declares, will be to Israel as a foe; the nation is thus undone. He who would be their natural ally is no longer there to help them. The ב is the well-known (so-called) *Beth essentiæ* (see Ges. Lexic., *s.v.* בְּ), and there is a close parallel in expression in Exod. xviii. 4, כִּי־אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי בְּעֶזְרִי "for the God of my father was my help" (lit. "was *in* or *as* my help," as here). The change from מִי into בִּי is a slight one, and may easily have taken place under the influence of the following בעזרך.

Micah ii. 7. הֶאָמוּר בֵּית יַעֲקֹב. As pointed, האמור can only be the interrogative with the passive participle; but

the construction in that case is singularly harsh, and indeed hardly affords an intelligible sense: "*Is there a thing said,*[1] O house of Jacob," etc. Hence Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, § 101*b*, treats הָ as an exclamatory particle, alien to הָהּ, Ezek. xxx. 2, and renders "*Ah! that which is said!*" or "*Ah! what a speech!* O house of Israel. Is the spirit of the Lord shortened?" etc. The vocative might be paralleled by Isa. xxix. 16, הֲפִכְכֶם "O your perverseness!" but there is no other example either of the particle supposed, or of such a use of the passive participle. Others, to obviate the first of these objections, read הָאֲמוּר (the article having the force of a vocative), rendering similarly *O the speech!* (Steiner, *ad loc.*), but without substantially relieving the awkwardness of the expression.[2]

A.V. (following David Kimchi) and Keil render: "O thou *that art named* the house of Jacob," *i.e.* O you that are named Israelites, so far as the title goes, but are not Israelites in reality (cf. Isa. xlviii. 1). The sense thus obtained is tolerable, though not specially favoured by the context; a more serious objection is that it is not defensible philologically. For, (1) the art. before א is always הָ not הֲ; and (2), what is more important, אָמוּר cannot signify *called* or *named: he was called* is not נֶאֱמַר but נֶאֱמַר לוֹ, lit. *there was said to him* . . . (as Isa. iv. 3, xxxii. 5). Keil attempts to show the contrary by appealing to הַנִּקְרָאִים *which are called*, Isa. xlviii. 1; but this reference is not to the point; for קָרָא, unlike אָמַר, may be construed with a simple accusative, as well as with לְ; and thus its passive (though even then rarely) admits of the construction with a personal subject.[3]

[1] The rendering *Num dicendum?* puts more into the participle than it legitimately expresses.

[2] Similarly, Caspari, *Micha*, p. 119 (*O über das Gesagte!*), and Kleinert (in Lange's *Bibelwerk*), but without distinctly saying how they explain the ה.

[3] נִקְרָא with שֵׁם, "*the name* is called . . . ," is common enough; but נִקְרָא with a personal subject, "*he* is called . . . ," does not occur earlier than second Isaiah (xliii. 7, liv. 5, lvi. 7, lxi. 6, cf. xlviii. 2) and Zech. viii. 3; see the more usual construction, נִקְרָא לְ; 1 Sam. ix. 9; Isa. i. 26, xxxii. 5;

אָמַר, on the contrary, is *to say*, not *to call* or *name*:[1] hence הָאָמוּר (הָ)הָאָמוּר will only mean *that which is said*, not *thou to whom there is said* (=who art named); the rendering "Thou that art named the house of Jacob" must accordingly be abandoned.

The sense required is clearly *Num dicendum?* and this may be obtained in a manner thoroughly agreeable to Hebrew idiom by the change of one point—by reading הָאָמוּר for הָאָמוּר; הָאָמוּר will be of course the inf. absol., lit. *shall one say?*—used with a touch of passion, as Jer. vii. 9, הֲגָנֹב וגו׳ "Is there stealing, murdering, committing adultery," etc., or Job xl. 2, הֲרַב עִם שַׁדַּי יִסּוֹר, "*shall* a caviller *contend* with the Almighty?" Render therefore, "*Shall it be said*, O house of Jacob, Is the ear of the Lord shortened?" etc., *i.e.* Will you accuse Jehovah of impatience? will you charge Him with being the cause of your misfortunes? On the contrary, *His* words are always good with those who walk uprightly: if misfortunes come, the cause must lie in yourselves.

Mic. ii. 12, 13. The interpretation of these verses is difficult, on account of the abruptness with which they are introduced, and their want of connexion with the preceding context. Apparently, they contain a promise of restoration after calamity; and undoubtedly such a promise is frequently met with in the prophets, following immediately upon an announcement of disaster, *e.g.* Hos. i. 10–ii. 1 [Heb. ii. 1–3]; Isa. iv. 2–6; but here it follows a *denunciation of sin*, so that between *vv.* 11 and 12 there is no

etc. Similarly, in the active voice, קָרָא לְ is by far the most usual construction (Gen. i. 5, xvi. 14, etc.): קָרָא with an accusative is much rarer, Gen. xxvi. 33; Num. xxxii. 41; Deut. iii. 14; and in agreement with the less usual construction of the passive in the same author, Isa. liv. 6, lx. 18.

[1] In Gen. xxxii. 28 the construction is: "Not Jacob shall be said any more (as) thy name, but Israel": and in Jer. vii. 32: "*there* shall *no more be said* Topheth, or the valley of the sons of Hinnom," etc.; the *It* of A.V. here represents an implicit לוֹ in the Hebrew, not the subject of יֵאָמֵר.

point of connexion whatever. Hence very different views of the passage have been taken by commentators. (1) It has been understood as a denunciation of *judgment*, the reference in *v.* 12 being supposed to be to the people crowded together in cities for fear of the enemy, and in *v.* 13 to their final flight when the capital was entered by the enemy. So, for instance, David Kimchi (who refers *v.* 13 definitely to the flight of Zedekiah "between the two walls," quoting 2 Kings xxv. 4, and Ezek. xii. 12), the Geneva Version (the note in which on "the breaker" is, "The enemie shall breake their gates and walles, and leade them into Caldea," and on "The Lord shall be upon their heads" [*sic*], "to drive them forward, and to helpe their enemies"), Calvin. But this interpretation evidently does violence to *v.* 13, especially the latter part of the verse. Others (2) connecting *vv.* 12–13 closely with *v.* 11 have supposed them placed in the mouth of the false prophets, as an illustration of their deceptive promises of security (to be construed then: "he shall surely be a prophet of this people (saying): I will surely," etc.). So already Ibn Ezra; and in modern times Ewald[1] and Kleinert. This is a far better suggestion than the former, and Isa. v. 19 or Jer. xxiii. 17 might be quoted in defence of it; but the contents of the verses are too characteristic, and too completely in harmony with the style and tone of Micah himself (cf. iv. 6 *sq.*), for it to be a really probable one.[2] Moreover, as Caspari (p. 123) observes, the verses *presuppose* disaster, if not exile, which itself would not be granted by the false prophets (see chap. iii. 11). The ordinary interpretation must be acquiesced in; but it must be granted that the verses stand in no logical connexion

Who, however, supposes that they were not originally part of the text, but were written on the margin "either by Micah himself, or by another ancient reader of the prophecy, as an example of such promises."

[2] All these interpretations are mentioned, and elaborately discussed, by the learned Pococke, in his Commentary on this Prophet (Oxford, 1677).

with the chapter as a whole. It does not, however, appear on this account that they are to be regarded as not Micah's own; nor is it clear that they contain ideas foreign to the age of Micah.[1] The idea of a scattering or exile is implied in chap. i. and in ii. 4, 5, to say nothing of iii. 12; the idea of the preservation of a "remnant" had been promulgated more than a generation before by Amos (ix. 8–9, cf. v. 15, where the word "remnant" first occurs)—not to quote Hos. i. 10, 11, xi. 10, 11; Isa. xi. 11–16. The *form* which the idea assumes is due to the imagination of the particular prophet; and the similarity of these two verses with Jer. xxxi. 8, Isa. lii. 12 is not sufficiently close to authorise us in treating them as an addition made to the book of Micah's prophecies in the time of the exile. Either, however, they are misplaced; or Micah's prophecies have not been preserved to us in their integrity, and some connecting link has here been lost.

The general sense is clear. Assembled as a thronging multitude at one centre, like sheep in a fold, the Israelites prepare to re-enter their ancient homes. The "breaker up," *i.e.* either a leader, or a detachment of men, whose duty it was to break up walls or other obstacles opposing the progress of an army, advances before them, breaking through the gates of the prison in which the people are confined; they follow, marching forth triumphantly through the open way; their king, with Jehovah at his side (Ps. cx. 5), heads the victorious procession (Exod. xiii. 21; Isa. lii. 12).[2] The scene is finely conceived, and the

[1] So Stade, in his *Zeitschr. für die Alttest. Wiss.*, 1881, p. 161–5.

[2] In *v.* 12 the sense of בצרה is uncertain. On the one hand the Targ. (חוטרא) and Vulg. (*ovile*), followed by Ewald, Hitzig, Gesenius, Caspari, understood a *sheepfold*, from בָּצַר, prop. a place *fenced off*, or *secured* (cf. the Aram. ביצורתא, which in the Targ. represents the גֻּזְרָה of Ezek. xli. 10, etc., *i.e.* a part of the court surrounding the Temple *railed off* from the public), which, though the word does not occur elsewhere in this sense (or in fact at all except as a prop. n.), would agree well with the parallel *pasture*; on the other hand, David Kimchi, followed by A.V., R.V., and Keil, understand by it the Edom-

past tenses represent it forcibly and vividly. The "breaker up" is commonly taken as denoting an individual leader: but the leader is mentioned separately afterwards (at the end of the verse); and the analogy of הַמַּשְׁחִית, הָאוֹרֵב, הַמְאַסֵּף, הַחָלוּץ[1] (all used collectively to denote a particular part of an army), may be pleaded in favour of the view that הַפּוֹרֵץ is meant similarly, and denotes that part of the army which was told off to prepare a free way for the advance of the main body.

The "breaker up" has been supposed by some to represent the Messiah, and the passage has even been quoted as typical of the Ascension of Christ![2] In so far as this has been held to rest upon the opinions of the Jews, it is apparently an error; the Jews identify *their king*, in the latter part of the verse, with the Messiah, but not the "breaker up." Thus Kimchi expressly: "In the Midrash (i.e. as expounded allegorically) the 'Breaker up' is Elijah, 'their king' is the Branch, the son of David." The passages referred to by Pearson do not substantiate his view. Thus the old Midrash of Moses ha-Darshan,[3] explaining Cant. i. 4, "Let us be glad and rejoice in thee," writes "When (shall we rejoice)? when the captivities shall ascend out of Gehenna, with the Shekinah at their head, as it is said, "And their king passed on before them, and *the* LORD *at their head.*'" This comment, however (to say nothing of the foreign ideas which it imports into the text of Micah),

ite capital, Bozrah, supposing this to have been the centre of a pastoral district, which is possible, though Isa. xxxiv. 6 is no proof of it. On the whole, the former view seems the more probable. In clause *b*, the subject of the 3 *pl. fem.* תהימנה is צאן, which is regularly construed so (*e.g.* Jer. xxxiii. 13; Zech. xiii. 7). The prophet, as he begins, has the figure of the sheep in his mind; but, as he continues, the thing signified insensibly takes its place, and so he explains by מרב אדם "by reason of the multitude of men": cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 37 *sq.*

[1] See 1 Sam. xiii. 17; Judg. xx. 36, 37; Josh. vi. 7, 9, 13.

[2] Bp. Pearson, *On the Creed*, fol. 270.

[3] In the *Pugio Fidei* of Raymundus Martini, p. 880. Carpzov (=p. 685, Le Voisin).

does not allude to the "breaker up" at all, but relates exclusively to the words at the end of the verse.[1]

The Midrashic passages cited by Schöttgen[2] are, if possible, of even less value, though one or two are worth quoting as samples of Rabbinical exegesis. Thus from the Midrash on Genesis, the *B'reshith Rabbah*, § 48: "God said to Abraham, 'Thou saidst, *And wash your feet* (Gen. xviii. 4): As thou livest, I will reward thy children in the wilderness, in the land of Canaan, and in the world to come.' Whence may it be learnt that He rewarded them in the wilderness? From Ezek. xvi. 9, where it is said, 'And I *washed* thee with water.' Whence that He rewarded them in the land of Canaan? From Isa. i. 16, '*Wash* you, and make you clean.' Whence that He will reward them in the world to come? From Isa. iv. 4, 'When the LORD shall have *washed* the

[1] The other passage, on Ps. lxxx. 10, cited *ibid.* and also p. 538 C. (=432, Le V.) is obscure, but receives light from the context, which, through the kind aid of my friend Dr. Neubauer, has been transcribed for me from the MS. of the *B'rêshith Rabbāthī* (see Zunz, *Gottesd. Vorträge*, p. 288*ff.*), in the possession of the Jewish community at Prague, by Herr Epstein, of Vienna (who contemplates the publication of the MS.). On the words (Gen. xl. 9), "Behold, a vine was before me," after quoting Ps. lxxx. 10, "Thou broughtest a vine out of Egypt" and observing that the vine is Israel, which had gradually extended itself and increased since it was first "planted" in its single (Isa. li. 2) ancestor Abraham, the Midrash continues: "So Israel were small below like a plant, as it is said (Deut. vii. 7), 'For ye were the smallest of all nations'; but they are multiplied above like blossoms, as it is written (*ibid.* i. 10), 'Behold, ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude.' The plantation from below; this is Abraham: the plantation from above; this is the Messiah, as it is said (Mic. ii. 13), 'The breaker is *gone up* before them.'" The argument is apparently a verbal one, based on the connexion existing between עלה, "is gone up," and מלמעלה, "from above": Israel originated humbly in Abraham; it culminates proudly in the Messiah. But the passage is an isolated one, and in view of the general tenor of Jewish opinion (see the passages cited in the text) does not show that the "breaker up" was a recognised title of the Messiah. The occurrence of the passage in the Prague MS. is of interest as corroborating the good faith of Raymundus Martini, which, as his citations are not always to be verified in the printed texts, has been sometimes called in question. It appears however that the quotation on p. 880 is more correct than that on p. 538.

[2] *Horæ Hebraicæ*, ii. pp. 62, 69, 135, 212. These passages (except the third) will be found in full in Aug. Wünsche's German translation of the Midrashim, called the *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* (Leipzig, 1880–85).

filth of the daughters of Zion.' 'Thou saidst, *And rest you* under the trees:'" the reward for this is established similarly, for the wilderness, from Ps. cv. 39, "He spread a cloud for a covering;" for Canaan, from Lev. xxiii. 42, "In booths shall ye dwell for seven days;" for the world to come, from Isa. iv. 6, "And there shall be a pavilion for a shadow by day from the drought." After other instances of a similar kind, we read, "So it is written, *And he stood before them* (Gen. xviii. 8). As thou livest, I will reward thy children in the wilderness, in the land of Canaan, and in the world to come. In the wilderness, as it is written (Exod. xiii. 21), 'And the LORD went *before them*,' etc.; in the land of Canaan, as it is written (Ps. lxxxii. 1), 'God *standeth* in the congregation of God;' in the world to come, as it is written (Mic. ii. 13), 'The breaker is gone up *before them*.'"

Again, from the Midrash on Lamentations, *Echah Rabbah*, on i. 22; "You will find that with whatever thing the Israelites sinned, in it they were smitten, and in it are they comforted. They sinned with the head; they were smitten in the head; they are comforted with the head. They sinned with the head, as it is written, Num. xiv. 4, 'Let us make a head (!), and return to Egypt.' They were smitten in the head, as it is written (Isa. i. 5), 'Every head is sick;' they are comforted with the head, as it is written (Mic. ii. 13), 'And the LORD at their head.'" The argument is carried on with the ear (Zech. vii. 11; Jer. xix. 3; Isa. xxx. 21), eye (Isa. iii. 16; Lam. i. 16; Isa. lii. 8), nostril, and other members. In the *Pesikta Rabbathi* it is resumed with other objects, including kings, which gives occasion to the verse being quoted again: "They sinned in the matter of a king, as it is said (1 Sam. viii. 5), 'Now make us a *king* to judge us, like all the nations;' they were smitten in a king, as it is said (Hos. xiii. 11), 'I give thee a *king* in mine anger, and take him away in my wrath'; they are comforted in a king, as it is said (Mic. ii. 13), 'And

their *king* passed on before them, and the LORD at their head.'"[1]

Further, from the Midrash on *Proverbs* (vi. 11); "'And thy poverty (read *thy head*, רֹאשְׁךָ for רֵאשֵׁךְ) shall come as a traveller:' this is the King Messiah, who will pass on at the head of Israel, as it is said (Mic. ii. 13), 'And their king passed on before them, and the LORD at their *head*.'"

None of these passages, however, identify the "breaker up" with the Messiah; nor do others that have been cited. The Targum of Jonathan, and Rashi, make here no mention of the Messiah whatever: the extract from the Abkath Rochel,[2] a work of the 16th century, and the comment upon it in the *Theologia Judaica* of Hulsius, do not show that the Jews so understood the term. Abarbanel and Pococke merely quote the Midrash, which has been already cited from Kimchi: "The "breaker up" is Elijah: 'their king' is the Branch, the son of David." Even Rabbinical exegesis, after it has identified the "breaker up" with Elijah, would hardly proceed to identify it with the Messiah; for these two figures are distinct in Jewish as they are in Christian theology. But "their king," in the latter part of the verse, is doubtless the ideal monarch and leader, whose figure the prophets delineate, and who in after ages is known by the title of Messiah.

S. R. DRIVER.

[1] *Pesikta Rabbathi*, ed. Prag, c. 1655, fol. 60[b] (ed. Friedmann, Wien, 1880, fol. 157[b]). The passage quoted above from *Echah Rabbathi* follows, but with Mic. iii. 11, "the *heads* thereof judge for reward," as the example of sinning, instead of Num. xiv. 4.

[2] Hulsius, *Theol. Jud.*, p. 142: "When the Jews are brought back from captivity, then will clouds of glory encircle them, and Jehovah will go before them, as it is said," quoting Mic. ii. 13.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

I.

"Paul, a prisoner of Christ Jesus, and Timothy our brother, to Philemon our beloved and fellow-worker, and to Apphia our sister, and to Archippus our fellow-soldier, and to the Church in thy house: Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."—PHILEM. i. 1–3 (Rev. Ver.).

THIS Epistle stands alone among Paul's letters in being addressed to a private Christian, and in being entirely occupied with a small though very singular private matter; its aim being merely to bespeak a kindly welcome for a runaway slave who was invited to perform the unheard of act of voluntarily returning to servitude. If the New Testament were simply a book of doctrinal teaching, this Epistle would certainly be out of place in it; and if the great purpose of Revelation were to supply material for creeds, it would be hard to see what value could be attached to a simple, short letter from which no contribution to theological doctrine or ecclesiastical order can be extracted. But if we do not turn to it for discoveries of truth, we can find in it very beautiful illustrations of Christianity in action. It shows us the operation of the new forces which Christ has lodged in humanity—and that on two planes of action. It exhibits a perfect model of Christian friendship, refined and ennobled by a half-conscious reflection of the love which has called us no longer slaves but friends, and surrounded by delicate courtesies and quick consideration which divines with subtlest instinct what it will be sweetest to the friend to hear, while it never approaches by a hairbreadth to flattery, nor forgets to counsel high duties. But still more important is the light which the letter casts on the relation of Christianity to slavery, which may be taken as a specimen of its relation to social and political evils generally, and yields fruitful results for the guidance of all who would deal with such.

It may be observed, too, that most of the considerations which Paul urges on Philemon as reasons for his kindly reception of Onesimus do not even need the alteration of a word, but simply a change in their application, to become worthy statements of the highest Christian truths. As Luther puts it, "We are all God's Onesimuses"; and the welcome which Paul seeks to secure for the returning fugitive, as well as the motives to which he appeals in order to secure it, do shadow forth in no uncertain outline our welcome from God, and the treasures of His heart towards us, because they are at bottom the same. The Epistle, then, is valuable, as showing in a concrete instance how the Christian life, in its attitude to others, and especially to those who have injured us, is all modelled upon God's forgiving love to us. Our Lord's parable of the forgiven servant who took his brother by the throat finds here a commentary, and the apostle's own precept, "Be imitators of God, and walk in love," a practical exemplification.

Nor is the light which the letter throws on the character of the Apostle to be regarded as unimportant. The warmth, the delicacy, and what, if it were not so spontaneous, we might call tact, the graceful ingenuity with which he pleads for the fugitive, the perfect courtesy of every word, the gleam of playfulness—all fused together and harmonized to one end, and that in so brief a compass and with such unstudied ease and complete self-oblivion, make this epistle a pure gem. Without thought of effect, and with complete unconsciousness, this man beats all the famous letter-writers on their own ground. That must have been a great intellect, and closely conversant with the Fountain of all light and beauty, which could shape the profound and far-reaching teachings of the Epistle to the Colossians, and pass from them to the graceful simplicity and sweet kindliness of this exquisite letter; as if Michael Angelo had gone straight from smiting his magnificent

Moses from the marble mass to incise some delicate and tiny figure of Love or Friendship on a gem.

The structure of the letter is of the utmost simplicity. It is not so much a structure as a flow. There is the usual superscription and salutation, followed, according to Paul's custom, by the expression of his thankful recognition of the love and faith of Philemon and his prayer for the perfecting of these. Then he goes straight to the business in hand, and with incomparable persuasiveness pleads for a welcome to Onesimus, bringing all possible reasons to converge on that one request, with an ingenious eloquence born of earnestness. Having poured out his heart in this plea, he adds no more but affectionate greetings from his companions and himself.

In the present paper we shall confine our attention to the superscription and opening salutation.

I. We may observe the Apostle's designation of himself, as marked by consummate and instinctive appreciation of the claims of friendship, and of his own position in this letter as a suppliant. He does not come to his friend clothed with apostolic authority. In his letters to the Churches he always puts that in the forefront, and when he expected to be met by opponents, as in Galatia, there is a certain ring of defiance in his claim to receive his commission through no human intervention, but straight from heaven. Sometimes, as in the Epistle to the Colossians, he unites another strangely contrasted title, and calls himself also "the slave" of Christ; the one name asserting authority, the other bowing in humility before his Owner and Master. But here he is writing as a friend to a friend, and his object is to win his friend to a piece of Christian conduct which may be somewhat against the grain. Apostolic authority will not go half so far as personal influence in this case. So he drops all reference to it, and, instead, lets Philemon hear the fetters jangling on his limbs—a more

powerful plea. "Paul, a prisoner." Surely that would go straight to Philemon's heart, and give all but irresistible force to the request which follows. Surely if he could do anything to show his love and gratify even momentarily his friend in his prison, he would not refuse it. If this designation had been calculated to produce effect, it would have lost all its grace; but no one with any ear for the accents of inartificial spontaneousness, can fail to hear them in the unconscious pathos of these opening words, which say the right thing, all unaware of how right it is.

There is great dignity also, as well as profound faith, in the next words, in which the Apostle calls himself a prisoner "of Christ Jesus." With what calm ignoring of all subordinate agencies he looks to the true author of his captivity! Neither Jewish hatred nor Roman policy had shut him up in Rome. Christ Himself had rivetted his manacles on his wrists, therefore he bore them as lightly and proudly as a bride might the bracelet that her husband had clasped on her arm. The expression reveals both the author and the reason for his imprisonment, and discloses the conviction which held him up in it. He thinks of his Lord as the Lord of providence, whose hand moves the pieces on the board—Pharisees, and Roman governors, and guards, and Cæsar; and he knows that he is an ambassador in bonds for no crime, but for the testimony of Jesus. We need only notice that his younger companion Timothy is associated with the Apostle in the superscription, but disappears at once. The reason for the introduction of his name may either have been the slight additional weight thereby given to the request of the letter, or more probably, the additional authority thereby given to the junior, who would, in all likelihood, have much of Paul's work devolved on him when Paul was gone.

The names of the receivers of the letter bring before us a picture seen, as by one glimmering light across the centuries,

of a Christian household in that Phrygian valley. The head of it, Philemon, appears to have been a native of, or at all events a resident in, Colossæ, for Onesimus, his slave, is spoken of in the epistle to the Church there as "one of *you*." He was a person of some standing and wealth, for he had a house large enough to admit of a "Church" assembling in it, and to accommodate the Apostle and his travelling companions if he should visit Colossæ. He had apparently the means for large pecuniary help to poor brethren, and willingness to use them, for we read of the refreshment which his kindly deeds had imparted. He had been one of Paul's converts, and owed his own self to him; so that he must have met the Apostle, who had probably not been in Colossæ, on some of his journeys, perhaps during his three years' residence in Ephesus. He was of mature years, if, as is probable, Archippus, who was old enough to have service to do in the Church (Col. iv. 17), was his son.

He is called "our fellow-labourer." The designation may imply some actual co-operation at a former time. But more probably, the phrase, like the similar one in the next verse, "our fellow-soldier," is but Paul's gracefully affectionate way of lifting these good people's humbler work out of its narrowness, by associating it with his own. They in their little sphere, and he in his wider, were workers at the same task. All who toil for furtherance of Christ's kingdom, however widely they may be parted by time or distance, are fellow-workers. Division of labour does not impair unity of service. The field is wide, and the months between seed time and harvest are long; but all the husbandmen have been engaged in the same great work, and though they have toiled alone shall "rejoice together." The first man who dug a shovelful of earth for the foundations of Cologne Cathedral, and he who fixed the last stone on the topmost spire a thousand years after, are fellow-workers.

So Paul and Philemon, though their tasks were widely different in kind, in range, and in importance, and were carried on apart and independent of each other, were fellow-workers. The one lived a Christian life and helped some humble saints in an insignificant, remote corner; the other flamed through the whole then civilized western world, and sheds light to-day: but the obscure, twinkling taper and the blazing torch were kindled at the same source, shone with the same light, and were parts of one great whole. Our narrowness is rebutted, our despondency cheered, our vulgar tendency to think little of modest, obscure service rendered by commonplace people, and to exaggerate the worth of the more conspicuous, corrected by such a thought. However small may be our capacity or sphere, and however solitary we may feel, we may summon up before the eyes of our faith a mighty multitude of apostles, martyrs, toilers in every land and age as *our*—even our—work-fellows. The field stretches far beyond our vision, and many are toiling in it for Him whose work never comes near ours. There are differences of service, but the same Lord, and all who have the same master are companions in labour. Therefore Paul, the greatest of the servants of Christ, reaches down his hand to the obscure Philemon, and says, "He works the work of the Lord, as I also do."

In the house at Colossæ there was a Christian wife by the side of a Christian husband; at least, the mention of Apphia here in so prominent a position is most naturally accounted for by supposing her the wife of Philemon. Her friendly reception of the runaway would be quite as important as his, and it is therefore most natural that the letter bespeaking it should be addressed to both. The probable reading "our sister" (R.V.), instead of "our beloved" (A.V.), gives the distinct assurance that she too was a Christian, and like-minded with her husband.

The prominent mention of this Phrygian matron is an

illustration of the way in which Christianity, without meddling with social usages, introduced a new tone of feeling about the position of woman, which gradually changed the face of the world, is still working, and has still revolutions to effect. The degraded classes of the Greek world were slaves and women. This epistle touches both, and shows us Christianity in the very act of elevating both. The same process substantially strikes the fetters from the slave and sets the wife by the side of the husband, "yoked in all exercise of noble end," namely, the proclamation of Christ as the Saviour of all mankind, and of all human creatures as equally capable of receiving an equal salvation. That annihilates all distinctions. The old world was parted by deep gulfs. There were three of especial depth and width, across which it was hard for sympathy to fly. These were the distinctions of race, sex, and condition. But the good news that Christ has died for all men, and will live in all men, has thrown a bridge across, or rather has filled them up; so the Apostle bursts into his triumphant proclamation, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

A third name is united with those of husband and wife, that of Archippus. The close relation in which the names stand, and the purely domestic character of the letter, make it probable that he was a son of the wedded pair. At all events, he was in some way part of their household, possibly some kind of teacher and guide. We meet his name also in the Epistle to the Colossians, and from the nature of the reference to him there draw the inference that he filled some "ministry" in the Church of Laodicea. The nearness of the two cities made it quite possible that he should live in Philemon's house in Colossæ and yet go over to Laodicea for his work.

The Apostle calls him "his fellow-soldier," a phrase

which is best explained in the same fashion as is the previous "fellow-worker," namely, that by it Paul graciously associates Archippus with himself, different as their tasks were. The variation of soldier for worker probably is due to the fact of Archippus being the bishop of the Laodicean Church. In any case, it is very beautiful that the grizzled veteran officer should thus, as it were, clasp the hand of this young recruit, and call him his comrade. How it would go to the heart of Archippus!

A somewhat stern message is sent to Archippus in the Colossian letter. Why did not Paul send it quietly in this, instead of letting a whole Church know of it? It seems at first sight as if he had chosen the harshest way; but perhaps further consideration may suggest that the reason was an instinctive unwillingness to introduce a jarring note into the joyous friendship and confidence which sounds through this epistle, nor would he bring public matters into this private letter. The warning would come with more effect from the Church, and this cordial message of goodwill and confidence would prepare Archippus to receive the other, as rain showers make the ground soft for the good seed. The private affection would mitigate the public exhortation, with whatever rebuke may have been in it.

A greeting is sent, too, to "the Church in thy house." As in the case of the similar community in the house of Nymphas (Col. iv. 15), we cannot decide whether by this expression is meant simply a Christian family, or some little company of believers who were wont to meet beneath Philemon's roof for Christian converse and worship. The latter seems the more probable supposition. It is natural that they should be addressed; for Onesimus, if received by Philemon, would naturally become a member of the group, and their good-will was important to be secured.

So we have here shown to us, by one stray beam of twinkling light, for a moment, a very sweet picture of the

domestic life of that Christian household in their remote valley. It shines still to us across the centuries which have swallowed up so much that seemed more permanent, and silenced so much that made far more noise in its day. The picture may well set us asking ourselves the question whether we, with all our boasted advancement, have been able to realize the true ideal of Christian family life as these three did. The husband and wife dwelling as heirs together of the grace of life, their child beside them, sharing their faith and service, their household ordered in the ways of the Lord, their friends Christ's friends, and their social joys hallowed and serene—what nobler form of family life can be conceived than that? What a rebuke and a satire on many a so-called Christian household!

II. We may deal briefly with the apostolic salutation. "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." The two main points to be observed in these words are the comprehensiveness of the Apostle's loving wish, and the source to which he looks for its fulfilment. It is perhaps accidental that we have here the union of the Greek and of the Eastern forms of salutation. Just as the regal title of the King, whose Throne was the Cross, was written in the languages of culture, of law, and of religion, as an unconscious prophecy of His universal reign; so, with like unintentional felicity, we have blended here the ideals of good which the East and the West have framed for those to whom they wish good, in token that Christ is able to slake all the thirsts of the soul, and that whatsoever things any races of men have dreamed as the chiefest blessing, these are all to be reached through Him and Him only.

But the deeper lesson here is to be found by observing that "grace" refers to the action of the Divine heart, and "peace" to the result thereof in man's experience. "Grace" is free, undeserved, unmotived, self-springing love.

It is love which stoops, which forgives, which communicates. Hence it comes to mean, not only the deep fountain in the Divine nature, and that property in His love by which, like some strong spring, it leaps up and gushes forth by an inward impulse, in neglect of all motives drawn from the lovableness of its objects, such as determine our poor human loves, but also the results of that bestowing love in men's characters, or, as we say, the "graces" of the Christian soul. They are "grace," not only because in the æsthetic sense of the word they are beautiful, but because, in the theological meaning of it, they are the products of the giving love and power of God. "Whatsoever things are lovely and of good report," all nobilities, tendernesses, exquisite beauties, and steadfast strengths of mind and heart, of will and disposition—all are the gifts of God's undeserved and open-handed love.

The fruit of such grace received is peace. In other places the Apostle twice gives a fuller form of this salutation, inserting "mercy" between the two here named; as also does St. John in his second epistle. That fuller form gives us the source in the Divine heart, the manifestation of grace in the Divine act, and the outcome in human experience; or as we may say, carrying on the metaphor, the broad, calm lake which the grace, flowing to us in the stream of mercy, makes, when it opens out in our hearts. Here, however, we have but the ultimate source, and the effect in us.

That old Eastern salutation "peace" recalls a state of society, when every stranger might be a foe; but it touches a chord which vibrates in all hearts. We have little fear of war, but we are all weighed upon with sore unrest, and repose sometimes seems to us the one thing needful. All the discords of our nature and circumstances can be harmonized by that grace which is ready to flow into our hearts. Peace with God, with ourselves, with our fellows,

repose in the midst of change, calm in conflict, may be ours. All these various applications of the one idea should be included in our interpretation, for they are all included in fact in the peace which God's grace brings where it lights. The first and deepest need of the soul is conscious amity and harmony with God, and nothing but the consciousness of His love as forgiving and healing brings that. We are torn asunder by conflicting passions, and our hearts are the battleground for conscience and inclination, sin and goodness, hopes and fears, and a hundred other contending emotions. Nothing but a heavenly power can make the lion within lie down with the lamb. Our natures are "like the troubled sea, which cannot rest," whose churning waters cast up the foul things that lie in their slimy beds; but where God's grace comes, a great calm hushes the tempests, "and birds of peace sit brooding on the charmed wave."

We are compassed about by foes with whom we have to wage undying warfare, and by hostile circumstances and difficult tasks which need continual conflict; but a man with God's grace in his heart may have the rest of submission, the repose of trust, the tranquillity of him who "has ceased from his own works": and so, while the daily struggle goes on and the battle rages round, there may be quiet, deep and sacred, in his heart.

The life of nature, which is a selfish life, flings us into unfriendly rivalries with others, and sets us battling for our own hands, and it is hard to pass out of ourselves sufficiently to live peaceably with all men. But the grace of God in our hearts drives out self, and changes the man who truly has it into its own likeness. He who knows that he owes everything to a Divine love which stooped to his lowliness, and pardoned his sins, and enriched him with all which he has that is worthy and noble, cannot but move among men, doing with them, in his poor fashion, what God has done with him.

Thus in all the manifold forms in which restless hearts need peace, the grace of God brings it to them. The great river of mercy which has its source deep in the heart of God, and in His free, undeserved love, pours into poor, unquiet spirits, and there spreads itself into a placid lake, on whose still surface all heaven is mirrored.

The elliptical form of this salutation leaves it doubtful whether we are to see in it a prayer or a prophecy, a wish or an assurance. According to the probable reading of the parallel greeting in the Second Epistle of John, the latter would be the construction ; but probably it is best to combine both ideas, and to see here, as Bengel does in the passage referred to in John's epistle, " votum cum affirmatione "—a desire which is so certain of its own fulfilment, that it is a prophecy, just because it is a prayer.

The ground of the certainty lies in the source from which the grace and peace come. They flow " from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." The placing of both names under the government of one preposition implies the mysterious unity of the Father with the Son; while conversely St. John, in the parallel passage just mentioned, by employing two prepositions, brings out the distinction between the Father, who is the fontal source, and the Son, who is the flowing stream. But both forms of the expression demand for their honest explanation the recognition of the divinity of Jesus Christ. How dare a man, who thought of Him as other than Divine, put His name thus by the side of God's, as associated with the Father in the bestowal of grace? Surely such words, spoken without any thought of a doctrine of the Trinity, and which are the spontaneous utterance of Christian devotion, are demonstration, not to be gainsaid, that to Paul, at all events, Jesus Christ was, in the fullest sense, Divine, and that Paul held, as the very foundation of all his hope of receiving the love of God and any of its gifts

of forgiveness or hallowing, the truth which John was honoured to crystallize into the deep and radiant words, "We beheld His glory, as the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; and of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." The double source is one source, for in the Son is the whole fulness of the Godhead; and the grace of God, bringing with it the peace of God, is poured into that spirit which bows humbly before Jesus Christ, and trusts Him when He says, with love in His eyes and comfort in His tones, "My grace is sufficient for thee"; "My peace give I unto you."

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

DR. SANDAY ON THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

THE admirably clear and sufficiently complete summary of the main theories in regard to the origin of the Christian ministry presently under discussion, given by Dr. Sanday in his opening paper, marks distinctly enough the lines along which investigation must proceed. The controversial productions of earlier years, though necessarily ranking still in any account of the historical development of the several theories referred to, have been so kept in view and used by Lightfoot, Hatch, and Harnack, the problems that demand examination and settlement, though not by any means solved, have yet been so clearly stated, that in a discussion of the opinions of those three investigators, all that is valuable in previous researches may be easily preserved and utilized. During the twenty years that have passed since the first publication of Lightfoot's *Commentary on Philippians*, with its detached note on the synonymes bishop and presbyter, and its appended "Dis-

sertation on the Christian Ministry," the controversy has been conducted within well-defined limits. Extreme views, that had been wont to receive serious attention, are now quietly ruled out of court by all representative controversialists. The moderate position assumed by Lightfoot has not been displaced in regard to any of its fundamental principles, and the only modifications that have been made, or at least suggested, are in the direction of determining more exactly the date of the transition from the presbyter-bishop to the monarchical bishop, and of fixing more in detail the relation of the several Church office-bearers to one another. Those twenty years, however, have witnessed an enormous massing of historical material, more or less serviceable in the direction thus indicated. The discoveries of the last few years help greatly in bridging over the earlier portion of that period usually called the Post-apostolic Age, through the empty spaces of which the older school of controversialists had allowed their imagination to roam with unrestricted freedom. One result of the discovery of those early documents, and the scientific researches based upon them, is the final withdrawal of all attempts to identify the episcopacy of the early centuries with that of modern times. Even the most respectable controversialists of the last century on the episcopal side felt themselves entitled to ascribe to the primitive bishop the attributes and functions of the Church dignitaries of their own days, and their opponents felt it necessary for the maintenance of their position to disprove the genuineness or minimise the importance of those documents, in which mention was made of bishops as distinguished from presbyters at what seemed to be an inconveniently early date. And even yet, the very fact that the same name is employed to designate an office-bearer of the early Church and an office-bearer in certain Churches of our own day will be apt to occasion a con-

fusion in the minds of the unlearned and uncritical in regard to the offices held by those so named. No scholar, however, will be found willing to risk his reputation by allowing any suspicion to arise that he is not aware of the vast difference that exists between the two in respect of jurisdiction, function, and daily round of duties. In this direction a decided advance has been made within the period above referred to. Hatch has, much more distinctly than Lightfoot, indicated the difference between the primitive bishop and the diocesan, of whom we naturally think when we now use the word. Dr. Sanday has adopted, in the most unreserved manner, the conclusions reached by Hatch as to the period of the development of the modern parochial system, which give the sixth century as the date of the origin, and the ninth as the date of the perfecting of the scheme of diocesan episcopacy.

There are two questions evidently of the highest importance in the present discussion, with which the theories stated and reviewed by Dr. Sanday deal in various ways. We have, on the one hand, to determine as precisely as possible the date at which the bishop came to be distinguished from the presbyter; and, on the other hand, we have carefully to indicate the functions which the primitive bishop had to discharge, and the rank that was assigned him. But before entering on these discussions, there is a preliminary question which calls for special attention. What is the New Testament usage in respect of those words that have come to be technical designations of offices and office-bearers in the Christian Church? We desire to obtain materials for settling the question on which Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Sanday are disagreed, as to the measure of resemblance that exists between the New Testament bishop and presbyter. Lightfoot calls these terms "synonymes"; Sanday says: "It must be wrong to press the identification too closely. . . . The mere

fact of a difference of name points to some difference of origin." We shall return by-and-by to examine this latter statement. Meantime we undertake a review of New Testament passages in which the words bishop, presbyter, deacon occur, in order to discover whether they are used as official designations, or in a mere generally descriptive way. The occurrence of the Greek word represented by our word bishop, both in its verbal and in its substantive form, is not so frequent in the New Testament, but that we may conveniently give a complete history of its usage. It is employed by our Lord Himself of the benevolent visitation of the sick and suffering, implying a general ministry of mercy (Matt. xxv. 36–43). This, too, is the sense in which it is used by James, whose epistle is probably the very earliest of all extant Christian writings (Jas. i. 27). The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews employs it with reference to the Christian duty of self-watchfulness or self-inspection (Heb. xii. 15). Then, again, in various places the word is used to describe the manifestation of the Divine care for man as a *visitation* on the part of God (Luke i. 68, 78; vii. 16; Heb. xi. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 12). The passages now quoted exhaust the New Testament usage of the word apart from those instances in which it has immediate reference to the office-bearers of the Christian Church. In all these we find that it has the same meaning of careful attention, on the part of God towards men, and on the part of men towards themselves and others. Is there then any reason why it should be differently understood in those passages that still remain? Peter, having spoken of the past condition of Christians as that of wandering sheep, naturally speaks of the Saviour to whom they have returned as the Shepherd, adding, however, to this figurative designation that of Bishop (ἐπίσκοπος, 1 Pet. ii. 25). This second term gives nothing new, beyond what is already contained in the idea of Shep-

herd; for the shepherd has, not only to search for the lost, but to care for the folded members of his flock. The addition of the term Bishop only emphasises that part of the Shepherd's duties which have reference to those within the fold. Both terms are evidently descriptive, and not official designations of Christ the Saviour. Then, again, in Acts xx. 28, we find the word used by Paul in addressing the presbyters of Ephesus in connexion with the same figure of the shepherd and his flock as had been used by Peter. These presbyters are represented as having been made *overseers* (*ἐπίσκοποι*), and the use of this term clearly does not imply any official title, but only a description of the main duties of the presbyterate. They are presbyters in respect of official rank, and so have entrusted to them the *oversight* of the members of their congregations.

In commenting upon these verses, Lechler (*Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, vol. i., p. 164), admits the non-official character of the term overseer as here used, but seeks, as it seems to us quite unsuccessfully, to conserve the traditional application of the passage: "If *ἐπίσκοποι* be here taken at once as an official title, it is clear that in this passage *πρεσβύτεροι* and *ἐπίσκοποι* are identical. Yet it appears as if *ἐπίσκοποι* (*v.* 28) were not an appellation of office as such, but rather denotes the work to which they were called (oversight of the flock in whose midst they were), and the responsibility which was laid upon their conscience. It was not however from accident that this very expression was chosen. Without doubt it was employed with reference to the official name *ἐπίσκοπος*. 1 Pet. v. 1, etc., . . . has a great similarity to the present passage. *Πρεσβύτεροι* appears to be an official name, whilst the business of the calling is designated in a free way by *ἐπισκοπεῖν*, but even here doubtless with an allusion to the official name *ἐπίσκοποι*." What ground is there for the assumption here made that *ἐπίσκοποι* was already an

official title? It is admitted that it is not so used here. Can any proof be advanced to show that it was employed in contemporary usage as an official designation? Even apart from the withdrawal of the word ἐπισκοποῦντες from the text by Tischendorf, as well as by Westcott and Hort, the passage quoted from 1 Peter can afford no help. Should that word be admitted, we have here but a parallel to the passage from Acts now before us; and until definite proof of the use of ἐπίσκοπος as an official name is forthcoming, we are entitled to suppose that this term was chosen simply because it suitably described the duties which the presbyters discharged.

We have now only three New Testament passages remaining (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1; Tit. i. 7), in all of which reference is made immediately to the holders of the office of presbyter in the Christian Church. In the passage from Philippians it would seem that ἐπίσκοποι are referred to absolutely, as though they bore this title in the same way in which the διάκονοι bore their designation. Now if it could be shown that already διάκονος had come to be the official designation of a certain class of office-bearers in the Church, then we should feel obliged, from the manner in which they are conjoined in the verse before us, to admit that this also was the case with the term ἐπίσκοπος. Throughout the New Testament the words διακονέω, διακονία, διάκονος are used very frequently in the general sense of service; then, of service under and for God; then, in Acts and Paul's epistles, of help rendered to the people of God, and particularly to workers for God. Beyond this the New Testament usage of the term does not take us. In Acts vi., where the institution of that office, which has often been assumed to be that of deaconship, is recorded, we find the first holders of the office described as serving or ministering at tables, and the functions of the apostolic office still wholly retained by the Apostles as a διακονία

τοῦ λόγου (*v.* 4). The historical development of this word within apostolic times was from the general sense of service rendered to God to the more particular sense of service rendered to the servants of God. It does not therefore appear that in such a passage as the one before us (Phil. i. 1) the word διάκονοι has any other meaning than that of helpers to the ἐπίσκοποι; who again, in reference to the διάκονοι, are those who have committed to them the main charge and superintendence of the Church. The Apostle addresses his letter to those who have the oversight of the Church at Philippi, and to their assistants in this work.

Nor is the case really different with the passages in the Pastoral Epistles that refer to the qualifications of bishops and deacons (1 Tim. iii. 1 *ff*, 8 *ff*; Tit. i. 6 *ff*). The bishops are emphatically rulers, preserving order and exercising discipline, and are required to present models of orderliness and propriety in their own lives; they must also be capable and efficient teachers; and finally, they must bear an unblemished reputation throughout the district in which they reside. Of the deacons, it is required that they possess not some but all of these qualifications. There is no mention of any restriction of their activity to one department rather than another. Though evidently subordinate to the bishops, their qualifications are such that they may rule and teach as well as the superior office-bearers. They are further clearly regarded as functionaries who are by no means indispensable to the proper equipment of a congregation. In the older and more extensive and complicated communities of Asia Minor they are found, while in the more recently founded and simpler organizations of Crete and other such places visited by Titus the need for them has not arisen.

The attempt made by Lechler (*Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, i., 166 *f*) to show that while the ἐπίσκοποι mentioned in Philippians i. 1 are identical with the πρεσ-

βύτεροι elsewhere named, "these names of officers were not arbitrarily exchanged," must be pronounced an utter failure. He does not succeed in showing any principle upon which the one term was used rather than the other. It is evident that in the Churches of Asia Minor the name of πρεσβύτερος was in use, and indeed, with the exception of the Church at Philippi, we cannot point to any Christian community of that age where that name may not have been in use, at least alongside the name ἐπίσκοπος. No attempt to associate the term ἐπίσκοπος with the Gentile Churches, and the term πρεσβύτερος with the Jewish Churches, possibly can succeed. I agree heartily with Lechler in his statement that "these names of offices were not arbitrarily exchanged"; but I find for that statement very different explanation than that which he offers. He is also clearly right in assuming that ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι constitute the entire number of office-bearers in the community, and that, together with the ordinary membership designated "the saints," they formed the whole of the congregation of the Church addressed. Why then has no mention been made of the presbyters? Lechler, Lightfoot, etc., say, because they are identical with the ἐπίσκοποι. Hatch would probably agree with this answer, inasmuch as he does not seem to dispute the identity of presbyter and bishop during the period of the formation of the New Testament canon. Harnack, however, insists upon distinguishing presbyters as officers of discipline from bishops and deacons as administrative officers, and he regards this as a fundamental distinction, one which existed at the very origin of these offices. We shall call attention immediately to his attempted explanation of the fact, that in Philippians no mention is made of those who occupied so important an office as that of supervising the life and morals of the community. But in connexion with the other and generally adopted view, that the omission of any mention of pres-

byters here is due to the fact of their identity with the ἐπίσκοποι, the question arises, Is this so-called identity one of thorough equivalence? Dr. Sanday, just like Lechler and Lightfoot, seems to think that there is some reason why in certain circumstances ἐπίσκοπος is used rather than πρεσβύτερος, and that after all the identity does not imply exact equivalence. The arguments of Hatch and Harnack have shaken Dr. Sanday's allegiance to the Lightfoot theory; but yet he does not seem prepared to adopt these scholars' statement of the distinctive characteristics of ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι. I venture to assert that Harnack has shown reason why Lightfoot's theory cannot be maintained. He not only calls attention to the obvious fact that bishops and deacons are always associated together, while no mention is made of presbyters alongside of these, but he points out that in 1 Timothy iii. 1–13 the qualifications of bishops and deacons are detailed, while in 1 Timothy v. 17–19 reference to presbyters is made in an altogether different connexion. In regard to this separation of bishop and presbyter, Dr. Sanday says: "I admit that in the passages which Dr. Harnack has enumerated (Phil. i. 1, and 1 Tim. iii. 1–13, v. 17–19) they may be regarded as separable." If so, it matters little though Dr. Sanday should refer to what he claims as a second century reading in 1 Peter v. 1, 2, and to the passages from Acts and Titus which we have already explained, as using ἐπίσκοπος as a descriptive and not a technical or official name. If we have no other theory to advance than that of the original identity of ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος in the sense of Lightfoot, Lechler, and Sanday, then no assumption of a common Jewish origin, such as Dr. Sanday suggests in the hope of narrowing the breach (pp. 104, 105), will in any measure invalidate Harnack's conclusion.

I venture to propose an altogether different solution. On a review of the entire New Testament usage of the terms

in question, we find that there are no indications of any regular differentiation of offices in the Christian Churches of the Apostolic Age. There is but one ordination or appointment by election, and that is to the office of presbyter or elder (Acts xiv. 23; Tit. i. 5). In respect of function, the presbyter is designated episcopus, or overseer. In the older Churches, like those of Philippi and Ephesus, which had been at least ten years in existence, and had during that period been remarkably prosperous, before the Apostle wrote his epistles to them respectively, it was necessary, in consequence of their dimensions and circumstances, that the presbyter-bishop should have assistants given him. These assistants had in all probability the same official appointment or ordination as the bishop, and by that ordination they would be constituted presbyters, as he himself had been. In the Churches of the New Testament the presbyter was the one office-bearer present in every organized congregation; while among the many presbyters required in the larger communities two grades were distinguished, as superior and subordinate, and the presbyters so distinguished were named respectively ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι. The conclusion then to which we have reached is this: *In the apostolic Church there was but one office to which individuals were elected* (as distinguished from the extraordinary ministry of supernatural gifts represented by Apostles, prophets, etc.), *that of presbyter, and if the size or circumstances of the community required gradation among its presbyters, those in full authority were called Ἐπίσκοποι, and their assistants were called Διάκονοι.*

Now let us see how this theory will stand the test of those passages in 1 Timothy iii., of which Dr. Sanday says that they may indicate a separation between bishop and presbyter. The contention of Harnack, homologated by Sanday (pp. 107, 108), is, that, although at first the

function of preaching and conducting Divine service lay with the Apostles and prophets exclusively, it gradually passed over, not to the presbyters, but to the bishops and deacons. But is there any ground in Scripture for saying so? Are not teaching and preaching from the beginning a part of the official duties of bishops and deacons? And are not presbyters as such required and expected to teach? Let us look at this last question first. Various interpretations of 1 Timothy v. 17 have been suggested. It was insisted upon by Rothe that no unprejudiced mind could possibly understand the Apostle as distinguishing two classes of presbyters as teachers and rulers, that the distinction indicated was between those who applied themselves laboriously to their duties, and others who did not labour so hard. Commentators have since come to an agreement in interpreting the distinction referred to, as one of more or less prominent endowment. There were presbyters who were prominent as teachers, others who were prominent as rulers. The reward or honour spoken of by the Apostle is to be given in acknowledgment of distinguished service, whether this be rendered in one department or in another. Those who rule well are to be highly honoured, but those who, ruling well, also distinguish themselves in teaching are to be especially esteemed. There is nothing here to suggest that any presbyter would be regarded as one who discharged aright his official functions, if he only ruled, and did not teach. It was indeed quite natural that in an age when supernatural gifts abounded, and Churches were still favoured with frequent visits of Apostles and prophets, the administrative and judicial functions should be especially emphasised in the earliest references to stationary and permanent office-bearers. But the supposition is entirely gratuitous that, during the intervals elapsing between the visits of Apostles and evangelists, the congregational services of communities organized like those of Philippi and

Ephesus were dependent upon the irregular and occasional contributions of private members, or that the edification of the general membership was so little considered, that any forward person or ready speaker might find free scope, while the elected office-bearers, tried and trusted men, sat in silence, because, forsooth, it might be that none of them possessed the gift of teaching. On the contrary, all the passages which speak of the qualifications of presbyters, bishops, and deacons make it evident that aptness to teach is just as indispensable a qualification as ability to rule. Kühl speaks of the *wish* that was evidently present in the Apostle's mind when he wrote to Timothy the recommendation, which did not amount to an injunction; but when he paraphrases the passage now under consideration, so as to make it mean that "the presbyters who, besides their wonted duties, undertake in addition the laborious task of teaching, are worthy of twofold and *threefold* honour,"[1] he presses the literal interpretation of the passage to such an extent, that we shall be obliged to understand the Apostle as saying, "that those presbyters who neither ruled well nor engaged in teaching at all were entitled to honour, though only of the first degree." If we say, with Kühl, that the Apostle means to award double honour to those presbyters who distinguish themselves in the performance of *official* duty and rule well, and triple honour to those who, having secured to themselves this good degree, performed the supererogatory work of teaching, we meet with the strange phenomenon of a presbyter *quâ* presbyter being commended and rewarded for doing that which *quâ* presbyter he was not required to do. If ruling were the *ex professo* duty of the presbyter, we should have expected the third degree to be conferred on one who performed this duty superlatively well. It is surely reasonable to suppose that when the Apostle speaks of presbyter's

[1] Kühl: *Die Gemeindeordnung in den Pastoralbriefen*, Brl., 1885, p. 20.

rewards he means that they are to be won by presbyter's work. If this principle of interpretation be adopted, we can, without misgiving, accept the threefold order of merit for those who conscientiously discharged the duties of their office; for those who, neglecting no department, distinguished themselves as rulers; and, finally, for those who, passing through these degrees, excelled in the exercise of that which was the most characteristic and honourable function of their office, that of teaching. The most honoured presbyter is he who does the work of the presbyter best. Yet Dr. Sanday says that 1 Timothy v. 17 expressly excludes the idea that every presbyter had the gift of teaching, and that by it "it is clearly implied that there were elders who did not labour in the word and in teaching." On the ground of a careful examination of the passage, I am now inclined to fall back upon Rothe's view, and to recall my adhesion given on a former occasion (*Presbyterianism*, p. 41) to the contrary view of Ellicott, which has been generally adopted, and is now very emphatically reasserted by Dr. Sanday.

Lightfoot admits that the work of teaching *must* have fallen to the presbyters *from the very first*, and have assumed greater prominence as time went on, while the idea that government was the first conception of the office is allowed to be a mere probability.

In connexion with this same point, the fact that teaching was a duty attaching to the office of presbyter from the very first, I think objection may fairly be taken to the way in which Dr. Sanday, as well as Hatch and Harnack, refers to the terms relating to teaching among the qualifications of the πρεσβύτεροι and ἐπίσκοποι. Referring to 1 Timothy iii. 2, v. 17, Titus i. 9, he speaks of the gift of teaching as a *desirable* qualification in a presbyter or bishop (p. 107). Similarly Dr. Hatch seeks to minimise the importance of the teaching gift, while exalting that of administration,

describing the one as desirable, the other as indispensable. Now, if we turn to 1 Timothy iii. 2, Titus i. 9, we shall find the teaching gift referred to in such a way that no unprejudiced reader could for a moment reach any other conclusion than this, that whatever importance was attached to the other gifts enumerated was also attached to it. If it be necessary that the bishop be hospitable and free from covetousness, as Hatch and Harnack so heartily admit, so also, according to those passages, it was in the same degree necessary that he should be apt to teach. This has been disputed in the interests of the theory that represents a distinct order of presbyters as a comparatively late institution of a teaching and preaching office, and of that which regards presbyter and bishop as two primitive and originally distinct offices of discipline and administration, during an age of unrestricted "liberty of prophesying" among the members of the Christian Church. By boldly maintaining that διδακτικός does not really mean apt to teach, Kühl takes the only course fairly open to those who would maintain that the exercise of the teaching gift was not originally demanded of the regular office-bearers of the Christian Church. He endeavours, in an elaborate note, to show that the termination ικος points simply to the possession of a certain quality; so that διδακτικός means one who has himself a knowledge of doctrinal truth, and is thus the custodier of sound doctrine (2 Tim. ii. 24). In 1 Timothy iii., according to this view, the bishop is not required to teach, but to be a referee in doctrinal questions, and so v. 17 represents the qualification of the presbyter for pastoral dealing with his flock. Well, let us understand it so. Then the presbyter's highest excellence—that in which highest distinction may be gained—is the cure of souls. In all respects, therefore—in respect of ruling, teaching, and administering affairs—the New Testament notices afford us no means of distinguishing presbyter, bishop, and deacon.

Then, again, those three names are never found together in any New Testament passage as they are in later Christian literature. Presbyter and bishop are indeed used (Acts xx. 17, 28; Tit. i. 5, 7) in such a way as to imply thorough identity; but there evidently presbyter is the official term, and bishop only a description of presbyterial functions, employed to introduce an enumeration of official duties and responsibilities. Then, again, deacon is never coupled with presbyter, nor is the one term ever used in a writing where the other is employed. I can find no other explanation of this than that which our hypothesis supplies, that presbyter is the one official designation, while both bishop and deacon are terms descriptive of presbyterial functions. Where only one order of the ministry exists, πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος are used indiscriminately; where not only ἐπίσκοποι, but also their assistant διάκονοι exist, the introduction of the term πρεσβύτερος, which answers not to one, but to both, would evidently be confusing. If Acts vi. be regarded as giving an account of the establishment of the presbyterate—a view entertained by many, for which much may be said—we have here the institution of the one ordinary and localized office which was destined to be for particular Churches what the Apostles and their assistant evangelists had been to the Church universal.

And now we pass beyond the limits of the New Testament canon to inquire as to the mode of designating Church office in the Post-apostolic Age. Between A.D. 90 and A.D. 150 we have a series of writings—the *Epistle of Clement of Rome*, the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Ignatian Epistles*, the *Epistle of Polycarp*—whose references to the matter under discussion are of supreme importance. What strikes us first of all is the extreme paucity of direct statements in the entire extracanonical Christian literature regarding the details of Church government and organiza-

tion. The EPISTLE OF CLEMENT is of special interest, because it clearly falls within the life-time of the last surviving Apostle. In it there is no single statement regarding the office-bearers of the Church that would imply the slightest development in organization beyond the point reached in the Pastoral Epistles. It is said (xlii. 4) that the Apostles appointed *ἐπίσκοποι* and *διάκονοι* in all the districts and cities where they preached; which corresponds to the statement of Acts xiv. 23, that the Apostles appointed elders or presbyters in every Church. Then, again, the term *πρεσβύτεροι* is used especially in connexion with an enumeration of Church parties: *οἱ ἡγούμενοι, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ νέοι, αἱ γυναῖκες*. Mr. Manley, in his excellent Hulsean Essay, has understood this passage as affording an exhaustive classification of the constituents of the Christian Church, in which no separate mention is made of any order of office.[1] He supposes the first term to be applied to the order of grace or the extraordinary officers, *e.g.* Apostles, prophets, etc., and *πρεσβύτεροι* to the older members of the Church, among whom would be included any ordinary officers that might there and then exist. He would thus understand all the terms here used, with the exception of the first, as applying to the membership of the Church—the elder and younger male members, and the female. On the contrary, I think the writing should rather be regarded as addressed to the active members of the Church, who had conspicuously taken part in the rebellion against the presbyters. They, therefore, the male members, would not be mentioned in a list of those unto whom they were required to act in specified ways. To the *ἡγούμενοι* they are to render obedience, to the presbyters honour, to the catechumens all needful service in teaching, and to the women or female members help in protecting

[1] *A Dissertation on the Presbyterate before the Time of Cyprian.* By W. G. Manley. Cambridge, 1886.

them from evil influences and developing the beauty of a holy life. We have here, as it seems to me, under the term πρεσβύτεροι, the very same set of office-bearers as is afterwards described as consisting of two divisions, ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι. Then, again, those who are spoken of as πρεσβύτεροι in xlvii. 6 and liv. 2 evidently are the same who are spoken of in xlii. 4 as ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι, terms which are clearly used to designate the entire ministry of a Christian community.

It will not be necessary to speak in detail of the *Didaché*, *Epistle of Barnabas*, and *Shepherd of Hermas*. The *Didaché* speaks of ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι, but makes no mention of πρεσβύτεροι, which, in a tract meant for Jewish converts, would surely be strange if πρεσβύτεροι were of Jewish and ἐπίσκοποι of Gentile origin, and the one synonomous with the other, or practically so. Further, their service to the Church—that is, not of ἐπίσκοποι alone, but of ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι, answering to the πρεσβύτεροι—is described (*Didaché*, p. 15) as the same as that of the prophets and teachers. There is nothing at all to warrant Harnack's deduction that they were administrative officers, especially financial. The *Epistle of Barnabas* no more than the *Epistle to Diognetus* makes any allusion to the ordinary office-bearers of the Church. This may be explained either from the individual tendencies of these writers, or the immediate purpose of their writings. In *Hermas*, again, the ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι are spoken of in such a way as to show that their duties were essentially the same, and so they together corresponded to the πρεσβύτεροι. From evidence adduced by Uhlhorn and others it may, I think, be assumed that the *Shepherd of Hermas* was not written before A.D. 130. Down to this period then we find no notice in any Christian writing to suggest any change having been made on the simple Church organization of New Testament times. "There were ἐπίσκοποι in the

Church, but no ἐπίσκοπος."[1] The extraordinary ministry is passing away. Hermas speaks of apostles and teachers, but no longer can point to any recognised prophets. But this decay of the order of grace does not lead to the supplementing of the order of office.

When we turn to the *Ignatian Epistles* we meet with an entirely different state of affairs. It seems to me that nothing has been advanced to show that these epistles must have been written earlier than A.D. 130; but even when that date has been assigned them, it is still no easy task to conceive of their contents as written by a contemporary of Hermas. All the more care should therefore be taken to admit no exaggeration of the difficulty. The ἐπίσκοπος has certainly become prominent, and his authority and rank are insisted upon in the most emphatic manner; but the very emphasis employed, and the unwearied injunctions to reverence and obey him, seem clearly to show that the institution is not yet well established, but a novelty struggling for existence. It is admitted that the episcopate secured a footing first in Asia Minor. The *Epistle of Ignatius to the Church of Rome* is distinguished from all the rest by the absence of every allusion to bishops; and from other sources it is well established that in Alexandria at a still later period nothing was known of monarchical episcopacy. The phenomenon, then, presented in the Ignatian Epistles is simply this: owing to some local cause, probably the prevalence of various heresies within the borders of the Churches of Syria and Asia Minor leading to schismatical divisions in the several Christian communities, the faithful and orthodox members found it necessary to rally closely around the most capable and trustworthy of their local Church officers, and he who in each community thus won the confidence of his fellow members obtained, at first without any formal appointment, the position of ἐπίσκοπος. In other districts, we

[1] Manley's Hulsean Essay, p. 47.

may suppose, a similar development took place, when the Churches there came to be beset with like dangers. This would become still more general, and indeed strict and uniform Church organization would be enforced, when the unregulated enthusiasm of the Montanist movement threatened the overthrow of all Church organization and order. Then in Ignatius we find a man who is possessed of one idea—the need of perfect unity among the members of a Church as a preservative against false doctrine. On his way to the stake, conscious therefore that his last opportunity for exhortation had come, he unweariedly reiterates his counsel to show unwavering loyalty toward the bishop. The personality of Ignatius should count for much. He had evidently secured a position as bishop in Antioch very different from that which Polycarp and the other bishops of Asia had in their Churches. But the Epistle assumes that what the bishop was in Antioch, that also he was in Smyrna and Ephesus. If about A.D. 130 the episcopate was established in Antioch, and more or less shaping itself in the Churches of Asia, we have here the early and gradual emerging of the ἐπίσκοπος from among the ἐπίσκοποι. It must be observed, however, that here Ignatius speaks of those from among whom the individual ἐπίσκοπος has been promoted, not as ἐπίσκοποι, but as πρεσβύτεροι. In this, as it seems to me, lies the special significance of Ignatius in the history of the development of the Church constitution. The recognition of one pre-eminently capable man among the presbyters or ordained office-bearers of the Church would have taken place naturally, apart from the interference of any powerful and impressive personality. The natural course of progress, as the Church grew and spread, would be to have the congregational pastor recognised as the representative of the congregation in the Church councils, and the other office-bearers as limited in their jurisdiction within the bounds of their own commu-

nity. The ἐπίσκοπος would have then become thoroughly identified with the πρεσβύτερος. Ignatius, however, clings to the names previously in use, and seeks to differentiate the ἐπίσκοποι of the congregation from the ἐπίσκοπος by assigning to them the name of πρεσβύτεροι. There had been a tendency before to subdivide the presbyterate into an episcopate and a diaconate, though everywhere bishops and deacons were so closely joined that their real identity in the presbyterate was scarcely lost sight of. So long as the terms presbyter and deacon were allowed to retain their primitive meaning, so long as they were not definitely appropriated to designate special offices, the appropriation of the term ἐπίσκοπος to the one supreme office-bearer of the congregation could not be secured. And so we find Ignatius bringing to bear all the pressure that his intellectual gifts, intense spirituality, and heroic self-sacrifice might well be supposed capable of effecting, in order to secure a free space in which the powers of the ἐπίσκοπος might be exercised and developed. To lessen the risk of his fellow episcopoi disputing his supremacy, Ignatius assigns to them the name that had previously been common to them and to the deacons; and so, instead of one order of two degrees, we have three orders distinct from and co-ordinate with one another. According to this interpretation of the Epistles, we have in them not a representation of the actual organization of any actual community of Ignatius' own time, but a sketch of the ideal unto which he hopes the Churches of Christ would yet attain.

Throughout the second century it would seem that no uniformity of organization was reached. Before the end of the century probably each congregation had its recognised pastor; but the other office-bearers, not only varied in number, but also in function and distribution, according to the varying circumstances of the several congregations. In the *Apostolic Ordinances*, edited by Harnack, and re-

ferred to by Dr. Sanday, we find, *e.g.*, a prominence given to the office of *reader*, which evidently reflects some local peculiarity of constitution. In this treatise, however, which is more or less dependent upon documentary sources belonging to the end of the second century, we find the Ignatian idea reiterated. Harnack points out the resemblances between its account of the ecclesiastical ordinances and that of the Pastoral Epistles, and reaches the conclusion (p. 52 *f*) that they are independent recensions of one common primary source. But instead of supposing, as Harnack does, that the author of the Pastoral Epistles and the author of the document belonging to the second half of the second century, which is incorporated in the *Apostolic Ordinances*, were contemporaries, because the state of the Church constitution represented in both is similar, we may rather conclude that, from the later years of the Apostolic Age down to A.D. 150, notwithstanding variations in the use of names and the introduction of local peculiarities, there was but little change in the arrangements for worship and administration in the Christian Churches.

The theory which we have sought to maintain throughout, according to which presbyters, either as ἐπίσκοποι or διάκονοι, were originally the only regular order of office-bearers in the Church, will explain another point, the significance of which, as it seems to me, Harnack has failed to grasp. At p. 36 *ff*, he calls attention to the manner in which the relation of the presbyters to the bishops is described in the *Apostolic Ordinances*. The presbyters are to care for, consult with, and have a superintendence over the bishop. It would seem that the ἐπίσκοπος stands out distinct from the πρεσβύτεροι only as representative of the Church among those who are without. Harnack evidently fears that this may play into the hands of those who maintain the original identity of presbyter and bishop. He notices, too, that widows are referred here to the πρεσβύ-

τεροι as elsewhere to the ἐπίσκιπος, as in the case, not only of the Epistle of James, but also of that of Polycarp. All that he can say in reply is, that the conflict between presbyters and bishops had not yet been decided, but that such an indeterminate state of matters must soon have come to an end. I venture to apply here the theory of the original institution of the presbyterate. The assertion here of the supreme authority of the presbyters is a reminiscence of primitive times, when they stood alone as the one recognised order of Church office-bearers.

In conclusion, two points may be repeated and enforced.

1. It should be always remembered that the primitive bishop, during the first six centuries, was simply pastor of a congregation, and in consequence of this position, entitled to a voice in ecclesiastical councils (Sanday, p. 113). The *Apostolic Ordinances* explicitly declare that even so small a Christian community as cannot furnish twelve male members may have a bishop, for the election of whom the neighbouring congregations must supply assessors.

2. The evidence of ecclesiastical writers later than those referred to on these questions is of little importance. It matters little whether Hegesippus calls James of Jerusalem bishop, as Eusebius reports him to have done, or later writers give to early presbyters of the Church of Rome the name of bishop; we must suppose that they simply give to those of whom they speak the title by which the holders of such positions would be known in the days in which they wrote.

JOHN MACPHERSON.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE BOOK OF PSALMS.—I.

The effect of the Revision of the poetical books must be judged of by different canons from that of the historical. One has to consider partly sound and partly sense. From the point of view of sound, one is naturally more exacting in the case of poems than of narratives; from that of sense, one attaches greater importance to the connexion of thought and to the manifestation of artistic unity. In the following pages, it is the latter point of view which will be adopted. The revisers of the Psalter deserve but little credit unless, in accordance with the principles of King James's translators, they have thrown their chief strength into the development of the sense. Dr. Scrivener has spoken in trenchant language of the "prosaic tone" of the Bible Version of the Psalms, which, "however exact and elaborate, is so spiritless as to be willingly used by but few that are familiar with the version in the Book of Common Prayer; a recension which, though derived immediately from the Great Bible, is in substance the work of that consummate master of rhythmical prose, Bishop Miles Coverdale."[1] It is possible that a musical editor might allow some little mitigation of this judgment with regard to the Bible Version in its revised form; to such an one I may remit the case. But I am sure that fair students will agree that sense has been cared for by the Revisers, not perhaps adequately—for poetry surely cannot be well translated by a company—but still in a praiseworthy degree. To translate the Psalter is a severe test of the grammatical insight of the translator. "There," as Sir W. Martin says, "the narration of facts gives place to an expression of the varying feelings of each

[1] *The "Authorized Edition" of the Bible* (Cambridge, 1884), p. 139.

psalmist as he looks before and after; oftentimes shifting his view suddenly, and passing through rapid changes and contrasts of thought and feeling."[1] Readers of Dr. Driver's *Hebrew Tenses* will know the importance of a thorough and consistent revision of the time-distinctions in the Authorized Version of the Psalms; with this book in his hand the reader will be able to test the revision far better in such points than I can attempt within my present limits. Suffice it to say, that the minute alterations of the Revisers in this and other respects will often commend themselves as much to the purely literary critic as to the Hebraist. By restoring colour and connexion they seem in many cases to invest the psalms with a fresh significance.

In the following paper I shall briefly justify some of the more significant alterations in the first sixty psalms. I had intended to take the first two books, but found a detailed examination was in danger of carrying me too far. In the second I will endeavour to group corrected renderings, and indicate, if I cannot set forth in detail, their value.

ii. 1. *Why do the nations rage?* In the period of Judaism proper a marked distinction arose between those who were within and those who were without the covenant, in short, between Jews and Gentiles or heathen. To render גּוֹיִם, "heathen" (so A.V. here, but not everywhere, *e.g.* at cxvii. 1, it has, "all ye nations"), prejudges the question as to the date of the psalm. The margin on "rage" is excellent. The ideas of "crowd" and "noise" are as closely connected in רגשׁ as in המה. In Prov. i. 21, the rendering, *in the chief place of concourse*, is justified in R.V. by the marg., 'Heb., *at the head of the noisy streets.*' So here, "throng together" is the true meaning; "make an uproar" might have been given for a margin.

ii. 12. *Kiss the son.* Both here and in *v.* 7 we find

[1] *Inquiries respecting the Structure of the Semitic Languages*, Part ii. (London, 1878), p. vi.

"son" and not "Son," because the latter prejudges the great question, whether an historical king of Israel is, or is not, intended by the psalmist. The margin shows the reader how difficult the expression in *v.* 12 was felt to be in ancient times. בר in the sense of בן "son," is Aramaic, and is only found elsewhere in Prov. xxxi. 2, a post-exile passage. It so happens that the words, "kiss the son," disturb the sequence of thought. It is not certain that the Septuagint translator had נשקו בר in his copy; δράξασθε παιδείας may be, not a translation of those words, but a gloss upon "be instructed," which afterwards intruded itself into the text. If נשקו בר means "kiss the son," it seems to me almost certain that either these words alone, or the entire psalm, is of post-exile origin. I am conservative enough to assume that נשקו בר alone is a post-exile addition, and that the psalm as a whole belongs to the regal period. The words are not quoted in the New Testament.

iii. 4. *I cry.* Not "I cried" (A.V.); nothing binds us to the past. *Vv.* 4, 5 describe the attributes of God in relation to the psalmist; He protects him (*v.* 4), and constantly answers his prayers (*v.* 5). Comp. v. 3, "in [the morning *dost* Thou hear my prayer."

iv. 8. *In solitude* (margin). A much finer and more appropriate meaning; comp. Num. xxiii. 9; Mic. vii. 14; Deut. xxxiii. 28; Jer. xlix. 31. "In solitude" and "in safety," are to the psalmist parallel and synonymous phrases. A paradox of faith.

vii. 7. *And over them.* As if the Divine Judge went soaring up to His heavenly dwelling. A.V.'s "for their sakes" is not ungrammatical, but "return Thou on high" should be exchanged for "return to Thy high throne." "On high" to an English reader is too suggestive of heaven.

viii. 5. *But little lower than God.* R.V. has done well in retaining A.V. (which agrees with Sept.) in margin. The new rendering is not above criticism. God (whom our

psalmist calls Jehovah) is directly addressed in this very clause. On the other hand, "than angels" (Ewald, in his latest book,[1] "than high angels"), limits the sense too much. To the Hebrew consciousness, there was no unseemliness in calling the heavenly beings "sons of Elohim," and even "Elohim" (comp. lxxxii. 1). Jehovah, and those who composed His court, belonged to the same class or family of superhuman beings (*elohim*).[2] Milton's rendering, "scarce to be less than gods," is still deserving of consideration; see Gen. i. 27 (comp. *v.* 26), "in the image of Elohim created he him"; Jud. ix. 13, "my wine which cheereth Elohim and men" ("man," as A.V. and R.V., is misleading in this connexion).

x. 14. *To take it into thy hand.* This is an evasion of a difficulty, no doubt; but evasions in a popular version seem unavoidable. The Hebrew simply has, "to give (or lay) it into (or, in) thy hand." The clause reads as if mutilated. A.V. (which the Amer. Revisers would retain) gives the required sense.

x. 18. *That man which is of the earth, etc.* For though Bishop Lightfoot's theory of translation was not that of the great English writers of the seventeenth century, yet the opposite theory is no justification for giving "oppress" as the equivalent of two very different Hebrew words in the same verse. In xv. 3, "neighbour" twice over is more excusable; "doeth evil to his friend" (R.V.) is not in accordance with Jewish ideas of friendship (see Prov. xvii. 17; xviii. 24).

xvi. 3. *As for the saints, etc., they are the excellent.* "Excellent" is such a weak word in modern English that one would have liked to see some change ("noble," with a margin, "*or*, illustrious"). The psalmist's meaning is, I imagine, fairly represented, but at the expense of Hebrew

[1] *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, iii. 2, p. 100, n. 1.
[2] Comp. Davidson, *The Book of Job* (Cambridge Bible), note on Job i. 6.

syntax. I know of no perfect parallel to such an apodosis as R.V. assumes. The only tenable version of the Hebrew is, I venture to think, Hitzig's, "To the holy ones who are in the land let it belong, and to the noble ones, in whom is all my delight." Hitzig explains the psalmist to mean that a portion of those goods with which (*v.* 2 *b*) God has endowed him belongs to the priests (who in 1 Chron. xxiv. 5 are called "hallowed princes"). Few will accept this explanation; but Hitzig's grammatical insight few will dispute. What remains but to make an emendation, which this is not perhaps the place to describe? If however we reject all corrections of the text but such as have the authority of the ancient versions, there is no alternative but to turn the Septuagint version into Hebrew, *Τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ ἐθαυμάστωσε πάντα τὰ θελήματα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτοῖς* (comp. the Greek of 2 Thess. i. 10). But a comparison of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion suggests that the Septuagint translator has merely paraphrased a current view of the construction of the received text.

xvi. 10. *To Sheol.* "In hell" (A.V.) is partly wrong, partly misleading. Who doubts that the psalmist expresses confidence that God will not give him up to the greedy jaws of the Underworld?—*Thine Holy One.* The capital letters imply a violation of the principle of parallelism. The context shows that the speaker is a pious Israelite, and not the Saviour of the world. The Revisers satisfied their philological conscience by placing in the margin "godly, or, beloved." The word which A.V. and (unhappily) R.V. give for חָסִיד (comp. lxxxvi. 2, A.V.) means simply "a pious one," "one who is bound to God by a bond of dutiful affection" (חֶסֶד is generally rendered "lovingkindness"). In l. 5; cxlix. 5, A.V. and R.V. have most unfortunately rendered חֲסִידִים "saints," more correctly given in xvi. 3 as the equivalent to קְדוֹשִׁים.

xvii. 14. *From men whose portion in life is of the world*

(margin). "In life" is taken to mean "in this lifetime." This view of the clause would be more plausible, could we render, with Hitzig, "whose portion is in a life without duration." God is the portion of the believer; what is that of the unbeliever? It is (1) the world and its good things (not merely "of the world," = something that is of a worldly nature); (2) life, in the lower and purely human sense of the word (= "a life without duration"). The sole advantage of the marginal rendering is that it favours an early date for this psalm. The phrases "life" and "men of the world" in the received rendering remind us strongly of St. John's ζωὴ αἰώνιος, and υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου in Luke xvi. 8.

xviii. 29. *I run.* But why are A.V.'s wrong tenses retained in *vv.* 33–45, and why in *vv.* 37, 38, does R.V. actually introduce misleading futures? No one with a sense of literature will think lightly of these and similar inconsistencies, which arise from the faulty arrangements made for the Revision Company.

xxii. 1. Some margin seemed expedient in view of the difficulty of the passage. The construction in the alternative version is that of the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, two other Greek versions, St. Jerome, and the Targum. It may be objected to as irregular; but see cxix. 155, and as Alexander says, "Who can construe a sob?" "My help" is, on this view of the passage, best taken as a designation for Jehovah; "help" = helper.

xxii. 8. *Commit thyself unto the* LORD. This rendering of the pointed text is in accordance with xxxvii. 5; Prov. xvi. 3, where the form גֹּל is evidently an imperative. And yet was there not a fit case here for deserting the interpretation represented by the points, and following that of the Septuagint, the Peshitto, and Jerome, all of which authorities read the perfect גָּל? Is the abrupt change of person which follows ("let him deliver him") tolerable?

xxii. 29. *Even he that cannot keep his soul alive.* A parallel phrase to "all they that go down to the dust." Most psalmists think of Sheól as the land where praise is silent, but this psalmist proffers as a *viaticum* to the dying the privilege of worship after death. Comp. Phil. ii. 10. A.V., by wrongly changing "not" into "none," introduces an idea foreign to the context.

xxiv. 6. *That seek thy face, O (God of) Jacob.* A good example of the conflict between tradition and critical scholarship within the Church. Tradition says, Adhere to the received text, cost what it may. Scholarship says, The received text is often inferior to the more ancient form of the text represented in the Septuagint, and the difficulties attendant on the ascertaining of this older form are no excuse for ignoring the results already attained. As a compromise, the Septuagint is in the main followed, but the rendering of the word which has dropped out in the Hebrew is italicized, as if it were simply due to a difference between the English and the Hebrew idiom. This has the authority, it is true, of A.V. margin (comp. A.V. lv. 21; 2 Sam. xiii. 39; Job xxxiii. 17), but cannot be defended upon grounds of principle. The margin, "even Jacob," is sometimes defended by lxxiii. 1; but this view of the meaning would require "Israel."

xxix. 1. *O ye sons of the mighty* (A.V., "O ye mighty"). An exegetical prejudice of the old translators is embalmed in the text, but scholarship comes to its rights in the margin. Need it be said that the psalmist is not addressing "potentates and rulers of the earth" (Poole), and that by "the beauty of holiness" (*v.* 2) and "his temple" (*v.* 9) he does not mean God's "holy and beautiful house" (Isa. lxiv. 11, compared by Poole)? Most scholars hold that בְּנֵי אֵלִים is a "double plural" from בֶּן־אֵל, and render "sons of El" (see first marg., R.V.). If this be correct, "El" (*i.e.* Jehovah) is represented as the "father" or creator of the angels

(that these are really meant, is clear from *v.* 9). But if "sons of Elohim" in Job means "members of the class of supernatural beings called Elohim" (see Davidson's *Job*), then we may take אֵלִים (Elim) in Ps. xxix. 1 as equivalent to "Elohim" in "sons of Elohim," and the second margin in R.V. is substantially right ("sons of the gods"). The only view which is untenable is to make "Elim" a synonym of "Elohim" in the sense of God. Jehovah is often called "Elohim," but never Elim; this word always means "gods" or "supernatural beings" (Exod. xv. 11; Dan. xi. 36). Comp. on viii. 5, above.

xxxii. 9. *Else they will not*, etc. The misinterpretation of A.V. destroys the sense of the figure. Jehovah contrasts the willing obedience which He expects from His people with the constraint which has to be put on horse and mule. Believers ought to delight in "coming near" to God; another psalmist says, "It is happiness for me to draw near unto God" (lxxiii. 28).

xxxv. 15, 16, 21. The tenses employed are out of harmony with those in *vv.* 11, 12, and the unity of the poem is destroyed. In the multitude of counsellors there is not always strength. See Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, ed. 2, p. 17.

xxxvi. 1. Gratitude is due for the various reading which is as old as the Septuagint (*his heart* for *my heart*), and which, with the two marginal renderings, restores sense to a fine passage. What the "oracle" is may be divined from the context.

xl. 9. *I have proclaimed glad tidings of righteousness* (margin). We are reminded by this rendering of the great prophecy of Israel's restoration (Isa. xli. 27; li. 7). Bishop Lightfoot may have insisted too much on uniformity of translation; but in the case of this important word uniformity was called for. The marginal rendering also at once suggests the true meaning of righteousness (see the commentators on Isa. xl.–lxvi.).

xl. 9. *I will not refrain my lips.* Contrary to all sound views of Hebrew grammar. A.V. was better.

xlii. 4. *How I went.* A decided improvement. "For I had gone" (A.V.) suggests a single action. "Went" is not indeed altogether happy; we want something like "einherzog." And why did not the Revisers combine the textual and the marginal renderings of the next verb, giving us "led them in procession"? This would have defined the meaning of "went." A.V. is of course indefensible.

xlii. 5. *For the health of his countenance.* But the marginal reading, "who is the health of my countenance," etc., is undoubtedly right (see *v.* 11, and xliii. 5). We shall do well however to substitute "help" for "health." English is not as rich as Hebrew in words for "help."

xlv. 3. *O mighty one.* A.V.'s "O (most) mighty one," bears witness to the exegetical prejudice of the old translators, who explained this Psalm of One "who is not only a Man, but also *the mighty God*, as He is called, Isa. ix. 6" (Poole). Certainly the Messiah, as many with Ewald think, is referred to in Isaiah *l.c.* as *El gibbōr*, and the psalmist's king is here addressed as *gibbōr*. But nothing in the Hebrew *compels* us to interpret this psalm as an ecstatic anticipation of the Messiah's advent. How Delitzsch can say (*Die Psalmen*, ed. 4., p. 358) that "*El gibbor* as one of the names of the Messiah in Isa. ix. 5 points back to Ps. xlv.," is a mystery, for this keen expositor is very far from holding that the psalm is primarily Messianic; it refers, he says, to some contemporary king.

xlv. 6. *Thy throne is* (the throne of) *God for ever and ever* (margin). The dispute among expositors is whether "Elohim" is the subject or the predicate. The rendering in the text is by far the most natural one, but it is difficult to believe that a psalmist would in one verse address the king as "Elohim," and in the very next verse apply the same title to Jehovah. The marginal rendering was

intended to meet the difficulty. Dr. Driver has however (*Tenses*, ed. 2, pp. 285, 286) well shown its improbability from a grammatical point of view. No Hebrew reader would have understood the phrase thus. Is it not a case for critical conjecture? The context suggests the idea that the king's success is assured, because God has established his throne, and because he loves righteousness (see *v.* 7). Bickell therefore, improving upon Olshausen, reads:

> "As for thy throne, [firm is its foundation,]
> God [hath established it] for ever and ever."

xlv. 13. *The king's daughter within* (the palace) *is all glorious.* The A.V., as one knows but too well, is constantly misinterpreted. "Within" means not "inwardly," as opposed to "outwardly," as if the poet meant "her greatest charms are those which do not strike the eye" (so even Herder); but "in the inner part of the palace" (*i.e.* in the women's apartments), as the margin more clearly puts it.

xlix. 5, 14. I content myself with indicating the corrections which go far to restore sense to this fine but here and there obscure psalm.

lviii. 1. "As otherwise read" means "as otherwise pronounced." The letters of the text may be pronounced *'ēlim*, as the marginal renderings imply that they should be (see on xxix. 1). It is well that two margins were accorded; for the first margin, though doubtless correct, much requires a commentary. The strange interpretation of the letters of the text embodied in the vowel points (*'ēlem*, i.e. *in silence*), was probably invented to avoid the rendering "ye gods," the key to which had been lost. Indeed, the word *'ēlem* was itself probably a new coinage.

lviii. 9. *The green and the burning alike.* The insertion of "wood" in italics would have made this clearer, and would have counterbalanced the insertion of "flesh" in the marg. rendering.

T. K. Cheyne.

"*FAITHFUL IS THE WORD.*"

FIVE passages in the Pastoral Epistles repeat with slight variations the sentence, "*This is a faithful saying*" (1 Tim. i. 15, iii. 1, iv. 9, 2 Tim. ii. 11; Tit. iii. 8). The Greek text is identical in all. Our English Bible disguises this recurrence in 1 Timothy iii. 1, by substituting the adjective *true* for *faithful*. The motive for this alteration is obvious if the translators were right in regarding it as a mere preface to the next sentence, the change would be almost a necessity. But this interpretation is highly improbable: for it assumes that the subsequent words, "*If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work*," existed already as a current *saying* in the Church, and that St. Paul did no more than endorse their truth; whereas they are more naturally read, apart from the preface, as the apostle's own independent assertion of a bishop's responsibility. Nor does the original at all justify the introduction of this idea of *truth* into the text. The Revised Version has, with its usual fidelity to the Greek, restored the word *faithful*, and emphasised it by placing it at the beginning of the sentence. But this restoration of the true text forces us to seek a fresh interpretation for its meaning; for the subsequent assertion, though *true*, cannot be designated as a *faithful* saying.

The same perplexity confronts the reader in the later passages in which the words recur. Our English versions again attempt to interpret them as an emphatic preface to a subsequent clause, in spite of the connecting particle "*for*"; which indicates, both in 1 Timothy iv. 10 and in 2 Timothy ii. 11, that the next clause is not an essential part of the previous sentence, but contains additional arguments in support of the former teaching. Nor can that interpretation otherwise satisfy an intelligent reader. For in 1 Timothy iv. 10 there follows a vivid picture of a devoted life animated

by trust in a living Saviour; in 2 Timothy ii. 11–13, a series of solemn warnings that our participation in Christ's future glory is conditional on our present participation in His death and sufferings, and on our present fidelity to Him; in Titus iii. 8, an exhortation to the preacher to be diligent in enforcing Christian duties on his flock. It would be a misuse of language to designated each of these successively as *a faithful saying:* all alike bear the stamp of original argument or exhortation emanating directly from the mind of St. Paul.

An earlier passage (1 Tim. i. 15) throws considerable light on the meaning of the word "*faithful*": for in describing the revelation *that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners* as *faithful*, the apostle evidently means that it was an assurance on which the penitent sinner could rely; it contained a pledge on God's part to man's salvation, most worthy of acceptance. But the same difficulty again presents itself as to the word "*saying*"; for St. Paul was not there quoting any previous saying of Christ or His apostles, but was himself embodying in new language, and expressing with apostolic authority and power, the central mercy of Divine redemption.

A glance at the original furnishes the key to this enigma; we perceive that our English versions have given a false colour to the sentence by rendering the original "logos" (the Word) as "*a saying*," and that the first step to understanding St. Paul's meaning is to remove this arbitrary gloss of our English translators. The deep meaning with which that Greek term was invested in the Alexandrine and Christian theology of the first century is well known; the opening of St. John's Gospel presents "the Word" in mystic grandeur as a Divine personality, the living voice of God embodied in the person of the Lord Jesus, when He dwelt visibly among men. Elsewhere it was the common word by which any ordinary speech of men or any written

language of Scripture was described. It ranges, in fact, from the simplest to the deepest thoughts of theological language, and it is the province of criticism to determine everywhere its true rendering. In more than thirty passages of the New Testament the Authorized Version has employed "*saying*" as its English equivalent, always with reference to some definite spoken language, or some distinct passage of Scripture. The Revised Version has done well to displace it from many passages of St. John's Gospel, notably from viii. 51, 52, 55; for in the conversation there recorded, Christ referred evidently not to any particular *saying*, but to the importance of keeping His own and His Father's *Word*. On the other hand, it is difficult to understand why it is banished from John xii. 38 and Romans xiii. 9, where definite words of Esaias, of Moses, and of Christ are quoted, seeing that it is retained in the case of other quotations.

But our present concern is with one particular sentence of St. Paul. "*Faithful is the Word*," whose life and power have suffered fatally by mistranslation. Five times he repeated this one emphatic sentence, as if to print it indelibly on the memory of the Church. On the first occasion he added a definition of the Word by way of explanation (1 Tim. i. 15): it was "*the Word, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.*" Now this definition does not point to any single message of grace and mercy elsewhere recorded, but to the Gospel as a whole. It thus furnishes a key to St. Paul's conception of the Word, as the entire revelation of the Father's love manifested in the incarnation. The Gospel was not then embodied in the canon of Scripture, nor had it yet taken shape as a formal system of doctrine.[1] The Word which presented itself to the mind of St. Paul was the preached Word, of

[1] The notion of a formal creed or confession of faith is not conveyed by the original of 2 Timothy i. 13, which suggests a mere outline whose details are to be filled up hereafter.

which he had been made a minister, and which he now committed to his disciples to be treasured as a sacred deposit and transmitted pure and unalloyed to the future Church. This idea of the Word differs fundamentally from St. John's, for he nowhere ascribes to it a distinct personality or identifies it with the person of Christ. But there is this much in common in the two ideas, that St. Paul here regards the Word in its unity as a whole, ascribes to it a spiritual life of its own, and asserts for it the definite quality of faithfulness. Just as the Epistle to the Hebrews figuratively describes the Word of God as living and active (iv. 12), so St. Paul here contemplates it as endued with a spiritual character corresponding to the character of the God whose will it expressed. His description of God's Word as *faithful* answers to his description of God Himself as *faithful* because He will not suffer His people to be tempted above that they are able: he claims thereby for the Word that it is a sure foundation on which the penitent can build, a rock that cannot be shaken, and an immovable anchor of the soul.

Now then let us try to grasp the full meaning of this repeated utterance, *Faithful is the Word.* It is an ejaculation which came straight from the heart of St. Paul, as he dictated his latest words of counsel to his children in the faith. The very nature of such a sentence forbade any direct connexion with the immediate context; these abrupt outbursts of strong feeling are of necessity more or less isolated: the key to its meaning must be sought therefore below the surface in the mind of the writer, and the sentiment pervading the whole epistle, rather than in any particular words or phrases. Now the tone of the Pastoral Epistles differed from his earlier, as did the circumstances of the writer and of those whom he addressed. His personal labours for Christ were drawing to a close; his active life of missionary enterprise had ceased, perhaps for ever; and

he was condemned to the compulsory inaction of a prisoner. But his care for the Church was none the less absorbing because he was precluded from active labour on her behalf; His mind only ranged the more widely over her distant future; his thoughts were busy with her internal organization and with the new dangers assailing her from within; and his counsels united the wisdom of mature experience to the clearness of apostolic vision. For the Churches which he had planted had outgrown their early struggles and established their position as regular communities: but outward success was developing new forms of spiritual danger; false teachers had sprung up within the fold; professing Christians had learned to wield in a selfseeking spirit the weapons of verbal subtlety and legal casuistry which had belonged to the rabbi and the philosopher, and to pervert with false traditions the original simplicity of the Gospel. On what safeguard then did St. Paul rely for the steadfast maintenance of the faith once delivered? On the abiding witness of *the Word*. In that Word he recognised the only infallible teacher of faith and morals; he trusted in the sure guidance of its sound and wholesome doctrine. Observe the earnestness with which he beseeches Timothy to preserve this sacred deposit committed to his charge. He had himself proved its efficacy in his deepest personal need; he had tested its power throughout his many years of apostolic ministry; and now, as he approached the goal of his Christian race, he was filled with an eager desire that his children might bear on undimmed this steadfastness of Gospel truth, to light the coming generations. Therefore, as he wrote, his fervent conviction of its value broke forth from time to time in the enthusiastic ejaculation, "*Faithful is the Word.*"

In the First Epistle to Timothy the remembrance of God's personal mercy in committing that glorious Gospel to a blasphemer and persecutor like himself calls forth this first

outburst of thankful adoration. "*Faithful is the Word, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief*" (i. 15). Thoughts of God's all-embracing love and of the Gospel's saving power for all classes of society, for all men, for woman as well as man, run in succession through the second chapter, till at its close he winds up with his apostolic amen, "*Faithful is the Word*" (iii. 1). The pernicious delusions of the latter times rise up before his prophetic eye and call forth his apostolic warning; but he is inspired with new courage by the thought, "*Faithful is the Word*" (iv. 9). The second epistle dwells with equal earnestness on the value of the Gospel whereunto he had been appointed a preacher and an apostle, on the sound words which Timothy had heard of him, and the good thing committed to Timothy, which he charges him to commit in his turn to faithful men who should be able to teach others also. For its sake he gladly suffers as an evildoer, even unto bonds: he exults in the contrast between his own bonds and the freedom of the Word of God, which is not bound, but has power to save; and breaks out once more into the ejaculation, "*Faithful is the Word*" (ii. 11).

The Epistle to Titus, though largely occupied with the practical requirements of Christian life, strongly urges the importance of sound doctrine as the basis of Christian morals, and couples the duty of holding fast the faithful Word with blamelessness of life: here again St. Paul's faith in the Word finds fit expression in his favourite ejaculation, "*Faithful is the Word*" (iii. 8).

Rescued, in short, from the obscurity in which our English versions have buried it, this sentence stands out as a noble testimony by an aged apostle to the Word which he had preached so long and so triumphantly. He has bequeathed it as one of his latest watchwords to the Christian soldier: and it well deserves to be remembered

in these latter days. For the dangers of the Church have not passed away; while her very success, the grandeur of her work, the glorious development of her institutions, and the enthusiasm kindled on her behalf tempt men to forget sometimes the importance of *the Word* as her divinely appointed guide and safeguard. We too need to repeat often, as St. Paul loved to do, "*Faithful is the Word.*"

F. RENDALL.

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

In a previous number of this magazine, Dr. Sanday has expounded and examined recent theories about the origin of the Christian ministry. In doing so he has taken notice of my contributions to the subject, and the manner in which he has done this calls for my warmest thanks. It does indeed afford me the liveliest pleasure to find that so learned and independent an investigator as Dr. Sanday is prepared to accept for the most part the conclusions to which I have attained. In the following pages I do not intend to restate my theory, but rather to advance some proofs in support of that theory which have not been hitherto sufficiently emphasised. I shall, in the first place, gather together the chronological data which we possess for determining the origin and development of the Christian ministry; and in the second place, I shall examine more closely the original documents from which we obtain our first sure information regarding the nature of the office of bishop. These investigations will be likely to cast light upon those points of Dr. Sanday's theory which are not in accordance with mine.

I. The Chronological Data for the Origin and Development of the Christian Ministry.

It is certainly a mistake to suppose that an institution in the Church had its earliest origin at that period when first we come to hear of it. Many errors in investigations in the department of Church history arise from identifying the time of the origin of an institution with the time at which we

happen to come across it. But, on the other hand, it is of the utmost importance that we determine carefully how far back it may be possible for us to trace an institution, and in many cases we shall in this way succeed in arriving at its first beginnings. In what follows I shall endeavour briefly to set forth the chronological data which we possess for the origin and the earliest development of the ecclesiastical constitution. This is a very important piece of work, though it has not hitherto been attempted. This problem would receive the most diverse solutions from those occupying different standpoints regarding the origin of certain New Testament and post-Apostolic writings. Any one, for example, who admits the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles will reach quite different conclusions from one who regards them as non-Pauline, and relegates them to the second century. Hence the following collection of passages will have weight only with those who take the same views with me about the date of the origin of the early Christian writings. To prove and establish these views would far exceed the limits at my disposal in this paper.

1. The oldest designation of the Christians is that of "disciples" (*μαθηταί*). It is found in the Gospels, and thirty times in the Acts of the Apostles, and also in the so-called "we"-passages: but it is not used by Paul. It may fairly be regarded as the earliest designation, for when the followers of Jesus called Him Rabbi (*διδάσκαλος*), they evidently regarded themselves as His "disciples." This mode of association, however, could not be of long continuance. Although, according to Matt. xxiii. 8–10, Jesus forbade His disciples to call any one but Himself *διδάσκαλος*, or *πατήρ*, or *μαθητής*, and the Judæo-Christian tradition observed this prohibition,[1] it was yet absolutely

[1] *Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ κληθῆτε Ῥαββεί, εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος, πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ἀδελφοί ἐστε· καὶ πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος· μηδὲ κληθῆτε καθηγηταί, ὅτι καθηγητὴς ὑμῶν ἐστὶν εἷς ὁ Χριστός· ὁ δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος.*

impossible that the circle of the followers of Jesus should remain without organization. During one generation, perhaps, in Palestine the designation "disciples of Jesus" may have prevailed;[1] but even then, alongside of it, other names came into use.

2. Everywhere throughout his Epistles Paul names the Christians "brethren" (ἀδελφοί) and "saints" (ἅγιοι). These names, as Weizsäcker correctly remarks, are derived from the nature of the community, whereas the name "disciple" expresses a personal relationship which ought not to be applied and in fact is not applied to the relation of the young converts to the Apostles.[2] The "brethren" and "saints" in one locality, whether in one province or in one house, form "a church" (ἐκκλησία); all the brethren of all places collectively form "the Church." The term "Churches" is met with first in Paul's writings.[3] But Paul speaks also of "the Churches in Judæa" (Gal. i. 22), as well as of "the Churches of the Gentiles" (Rom. xvi. 4). It is therefore probable that Paul was not the first to use the designation "Church," nor even those of "brethren" and "saints." The Church as a collective name for all Christians ("the Church of God") first appears in the Epistle to the Galatians and in 1 Corinthians, but in addition to it Paul also uses the phrase *αἱ ἐκκλησίαι*.

3. The term "Synagogue" as a designation of the Christian congregation occurs first in James ii. 2; but it is certainly there introduced as a phrase already current. Not only the later Jewish-Christians, but also the Marcionites called their assemblies "synagogues."[4]

[1] Weizsäcker has done a great service in his *Apostol. Zeitalter der christl. Kirche* (1886), p. 36, by pointing this out. On the designation of Jesus as διδάσκαλος, which continued down to the second century, see my *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, p. 25.

[2] Compare Paul's warning in 1 Cor. iii. 3 ff.

[3] I do not reckon Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 17.

[4] See my Notes on Hermas, Mand. xi. I set aside the names Galileans, Nazareans, Christians, the Poor.

4. The earliest witness which we possess for the beginning of a constitution of the Christian Church is to be found in Acts vi. 1 ff. It is here declared that the Apostles exercised the *διακονία τοῦ λόγου,* and that persons were chosen by the congregation in Jerusalem about A.D. 34, who should undertake the *διακονία τῶν τραπεζῶν.*[1] *The distinction therefore between a διακονία τοῦ λόγου and a διακονία τῶν τραπεζῶν is the earliest datum in the history of Church organization.* This is of extreme importance: Preaching of the Gospel, on the one hand; care of the needy, on the other hand. We meet with this same division in Paul's writings; only with him the *διακονία* alongside of the preaching of the word has a much wider signification.

5. As regards the *διακονία τοῦ λόγου* Paul considers it an acknowledged fact, that God had ordained in the Church first Apostles, then Prophets, then Teachers (1 Cor. xii. 28). The expression "in the Church," that is, in Christendom, makes it quite evident that it is not merely an institution in the Pauline Churches that is referred to, but an arrangement or ordinance of Christendom as a whole. In the Churches of Judæa also must Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers have been acknowledged. This follows from the words of Paul, and is confirmed by the historical record in the Acts. Even the congregation of Jerusalem had its Prophets.[2] We might here indeed go a step further. The development of the association of Christian disciples in Judæa, who regarded themselves as saints and brethren, into congregations, and the consequent origin of an organization, could take place

[1] It is admitted that the first five chapters of the Acts are beset by many critical difficulties. The section, however, consisting of chap. vi. 1 ff., is distinguished in various particulars from that which precedes. Every reader who studies the Acts of the Apostles with care will observe that when from reading the first five chapters he passes on to the sixth, he here at once enters on historical ground. The narrative in the first five chapters is of a pictorial, panegyrical, and vague description; in the section, chap. vi. 1 ff., on the contrary, it is concrete and precise.

[2] Acts xi. 27; xv. 32; xxi. 10; Matt. x. 41.

only when the conviction was gained that the Holy Spirit, God Himself, was the founder of that organization. But this conviction does lie at the basis of the proposition: *οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους.* These, however, *λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ* must have been of very early origin.[1] The Epistle to the Corinthians, which presupposes the existence of such an institution, was written in the year 50. But even so early as the year 40 there were men so described present in Antioch.[2] It may therefore be assumed that even then there were in the congregation at Jerusalem not only the Apostles but also Prophets and Teachers. There was a "Teacher" in all the larger synagogues; but the Christian community showed itself to be the true Israel of the latter days, because it consisted of holy brethren, because its teachers were filled with the Holy Spirit, and alongside of them stood Apostles and Prophets, called directly by the Holy Ghost. We should perhaps be putting the date rather too far on were we to assume that ten years after the death of Jesus Prophets and Teachers were first brought forward. The passage quoted above from the Epistle to the Corinthians renders it probable that Paul was not aware of any time when the Church had not Prophets and Teachers.[3]

6. A special position in the Church of Jerusalem is assigned to James by Galatians i. 19; ii. 9, 12; 1 Corinthians xv. 7; Acts xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18, as well as by later tradition. (Compare the Pseudo-Clementine writings, also the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which declares that

[1] As to the Apostles this is self-evident, for the apostolate was founded by Jesus naturally not as an office but as a ministry of preaching. What they were to be for *οἱ ἔξω*, the Prophets and Teachers should be for the Church itself.

[2] See Acts xiii. 1 f. This again is a passage that also bears the marks of higher credibility.

[3] On Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, see my dissertation in *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. pp. 93–137. Its conclusions have been substantially adopted by Dr. Sanday.

James was the first to see the risen Saviour.) When this began is not precisely indicated; but that it had not existed from the beginning follows both from the statement of Paul in 1 Corinthians xv. 7, and from the history given in the Acts. According to the narrative of Acts, Peter and John were at the first the heads of the Church, and it is only in chap. xii. 17 that we are told incidentally that now James stands at its head. But Paul reports that James had been favoured with a manifestation of Christ only after Christ had already appeared to over five hundred brethren at once, that is undoubtedly some considerable time after the resurrection, although indeed before the manifestation granted to Paul. But before James had seen the Lord he could not have played a distinguished part in the Church. That he ever did secure such a position was probably owing to his relationship with Jesus. That this was so appears from the fact that after his death another relative of Jesus was chosen as the president of the Church in Jerusalem, as well as from the report of Julius Africanus, that even in other Palestinian Churches the presidency was given to relatives of Jesus.[1] Such preference given to blood relations is nothing unusual in the East; we know of quite similar occurrences among the Elkesaites and among the Mohammedans. It is nevertheless interesting, as it shows that from the earliest times the tendency to look upon Jesus as the "Teacher" had been surmounted. To give the presidency to the blood relations of a "Teacher" would be simply preposterous. From the high consideration shown to the relations of Jesus it follows that Jesus was Himself revered as the Messiah and therefore also as King. Our original documents, however, do not contain any express statements that would enable us to determine the position of James in Jerusalem more exactly. Of the nature and

[1] See Jul. Africanus, *Ep. ad Aristidem.* Also the quotations from the Egyptian Hegesippus, in Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii. iii.

jurisdiction of his office we cannot form the least idea.[1] What is said in the Pseudo-Clementine writings is of no weight at all, indeed it is so worthless that we cannot even learn from them the later Jewish-Christian opinions regarding James. Those writings describe James as a "bishop," even as "bishop of the bishops." But it has not been proved that the Jewish-Christians had as much as a single bishop. Therefore the redactions in which the Pseudo-Clementine writings have come down to us are of Gentile-Christian origin. No stress need be laid on the fact that Eusebius has given the name of "bishops" to the presidents of the Church of Jerusalem down to the time of the destruction of the city under Hadrian.

7. The independent administration of the Churches is presented to us not only in the Pauline Epistles,[2] but also in the Acts of the Apostles[3] as the primitive mode of organization. This perfect independence of the various local Churches is also presupposed in 1 Clement 54, 2.

8. Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers are not congregational office bearers; but persons are chosen and inspired by the Holy Spirit, to whom is entrusted the ministry of the preaching of the word. Alongside of them, however, Paul recognises in the Churches a series of functions which depend upon the operation of the Holy Spirit, and in their manifoldness make the Church into an organism. The various ministries are the consequence of various charisms, and they cause the Church to become ἓν σῶμα. Of such charisms or ministrations Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians xii. 28: δυνάμεις, χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ἀντιλήμψεις, κυβερνήσεις, γένη γλωσσῶν. Regarding these too, as well as regarding

[1] According to Hegesippus his office is to be regarded as of a sacerdotal character; but we may well question whether Hegesippus is here relying upon a trustworthy document.

[2] See especially the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and compare Weizsäcker, *Apostol. Zeitalter*, p. 623 ff.

[3] See Acts i. 23; vi. 5; xv. 20; xv. 12, 22 f.; xxi. 22.

Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, he assumes that they never have been, and never could be, wanting in the Churches. Thus the pneumatical organization of the Churches is just as old as the official organization of the Church. Seeing then that it is evident that there have been particular persons who were endowed with the gift of speaking with tongues, of healing, of working miracles, etc., there must also have been particular persons who were endowed as ἀντιλήμψεις and κυβερνήσεις. But a particular designation has scarcely yet been given them, otherwise the Apostle would have used their name when referring to them in company with Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers. But even at the time when the independent administration of the Churches was most emphatically maintained, there were functions which always only an individual or a small committee could discharge. "In the first rank," as Weizsäcker correctly remarks in his *Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 630 f., "were certain ministries, which lead to a Church office, demanded by the requirements of the assemblies. Among these might be named the providing a place of meeting and the arrangement of it, looking after the sacred Scriptures, the preparation of the Lord's Supper, as also for the administration of baptism, and the preservation of the Scripture portions which belonged to the congregation. The assemblies, too, would need personal direction to determine the order of lectures and communications, and also for the closing of the meetings. Besides this, the behaviour of members when away from their assemblies, especially in large cities, and of those abroad, would call for a special ministry. In discharging these functions one would naturally pass over into exhortation, comforting and admonition, and the ministry would in this way attain to a higher significance." To this we may add, that attention to the sick and poor and to travellers could not be required of the whole community, but of certain individuals, and so essentially the circle of ἀντιλήμψεις

and κυβερνήσεις was called into being. These then have been in existence in the Churches from the beginning. They constituted the διακονίαι, which those discharged who are called διάκονοι in the widest sense of the term.[1]

9. The designation "those that are over you" (προϊστάμενοι) is first met with in the earliest of Paul's Epistles, 1 Thess. v. 12 f. But their connexion with those who "labour" in the Church, and with those who "exhort,"[2] as well as the following verse, which urges every member of the Church to discharge the same duties that in a special degree are required of those persons,[3] shows that here we have not yet to do with an *office*, but only a work or activity.[4] This becomes quite clear from Rom. xii. 6–8. In that passage, the προϊστάμενος stands between the μεταδιδούς and the ἐλεῶν, and is described as one endowed with a charism.[5] Those who were the first workers in the Church—the first converts[6]—who had given the use of their house for the meetings of the congregation,[7] who had given themselves wholly over to the service of the Church[8]—have

[1] For διακονία in this sense see 1 Cor. xii. 5; for διάκονος, Matt. xx. 26; Mark ix. 35; v. 43; 1 Cor. iii. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 6; vi. 4, etc.

[2] The passage reads: ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, εἰδέναι τοὺς κοπιῶντας ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν ἐν Κυρίῳ, καὶ νουθετοῦντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν.

[3] See the 14th verse.

[4] Compare the word ἔργον in verse 12. The reference is not to official character, but to the work.

[5] Ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα, . . . εἴτε προφητείαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, εἴτε διακονίαν ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει, ὁ μεταδιδοὺς ἐν ἁπλότητι, ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν σπουδῇ, ὁ ἐλεῶν ἐν ἱλαρότητι.

[6] 1 Cor. xvi. 15; Rom. xvi. 5.

[7] Ἡ κατ' οἶκον ἐκκλησία: Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2; also Rom. xvi. 10, 11, 14, 15.

[8] 1 Cor. xvi. 15: Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί· οἴδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας, καὶ εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς· ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑποτάσσησθε τοῖς τοιούτοις, καὶ παντὶ τῷ συνεργοῦντι καὶ κοπιῶντι. In these few words we have an entire history,—the history of the beginning of a presidentship in the churches. Comp. Rom. xvi. 1 ff.: Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν Φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, οὖσαν διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς, . . . καὶ γὰρ αὕτη προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη, καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ. A helper she had become by her service

quite naturally had accorded to them a pre-eminence. To such persons the members of the Church are to render obedience just on account of their service.[1] The exhortation of the Apostle here also shows "that it has reference not to a regular office, but to an actually existing relationship, where the duties continue to be discharged voluntarily, and which depends upon the good-will of the congregation."[2]

In the Epistles of the Apostle Paul which were written before his Roman imprisonment, we do not meet with official persons in the strict sense of the word, nor with terms designating office, nor with Presbyters. Yet there are indeed in the Churches persons who, on account of their special position—that is, on account of their work and service rendered to the Church—are spoken of as those who have the rule. They form alongside of the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, an order of rulers.[3]

10. In the Epistle to the Philippians, chap. i. 1, there are named for the first time, and that indeed in the address, "bishops and deacons." This belongs to about the year 63. The Epistle itself generally, and especially in the 4th chapter, presupposes the same independent system of organization to prevail in the Church as had been usual in earlier times. There cannot, therefore, yet be any reference to an ecclesiastical office of authority over the Church. But there are two points here that are new: (1) The minis-

rendered to the whole Church. Hence in this place διάκονος cannot be understood in its later acceptation. It is not an inferior order of the ministry that is intended, but the highest and most comprehensive form of service.

[1] See the "ὑποτάσσησθε" of 1 Cor. xvi. 16.

[2] See Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 632.

[3] The word ἡγούμενοι does not occur in Paul's writings. It is met with first in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which thereby proves its extreme antiquity, inasmuch as only the teachers of the Divine word are so named, and no other persons are singled out for honour. See chap. xiii. 7, 17. Ἡγούμενοι are further mentioned also in 1 Clement i. 3; xxi. 6, in connection with πρεσβύτεροι; in Acts xv. 22, 32, where the Prophets are so designated; and in Hermas, Vis. ii. 2, 6, and iii. 9, 7.

try in the Churches has become divided into a higher and a lower ministry; and (2) Those who discharge these ministries have obtained special designations, in the one case *bishops*, and in the other case *deacons*. The latter name has therefore now received a narrower signification, and designates a lower order of ministry. But this definite naming, "overseers and ministers," is a step in the progressive development of the highest importance. Persons who in a society bear definite names which indicate their functions must by a natural transition pass over into the rank of official persons. We do not learn more particularly from the Epistle what it was that the overseers in Philippi had to superintend. But if we keep in mind that Paul wrote this letter for the purpose of thanking the Church for its present, it may be assumed that the overseers had to superintend the delivery of gifts in the congregational gatherings, and so generally to take charge of the assemblies.[1]

All forms of order and constitution not contained under one or other of these ten points belong to the post-Pauline period; that is, they cannot be dated till after the year 64, *and most probably did not exist earlier.*

11. "Evangelists" are named for the first time in connection with "Apostles" in the Epistle to the Ephesians, chap. iv. 11, that is, in the post-Pauline times, for the Epistle to the Ephesians was not written by Paul, but a considerable time after the Apostle's death. The distinction made between Apostles and Evangelists shows that the expression "Apostle" was beginning to be used in a restricted sense. The word "Evangelist" is in the pre-Catholic literature very rarely found, only indeed in Acts xxi. 8; 2 Tim. iv. 5; and in an ancient documentary source of the so-called *Apostolic Ecclesiastical Ordinances*.[2]

[1] This will be more fully treated under our second division.

[2] See *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, 18.

12. It is first in the Epistle of Clement, written about A.D. 96,[1] and in the *Didaché*,[2] that we meet with "bishops and deacons" as regular officers elected by the Churches. In the latter it is said: *Χειροτονήσατε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους*; but Clement states that the appointment of bishops and deacons was made *συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης* (chap. xliv. 3), and shows that the *προστασσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους* constitutes the highest judicature in the Church (chap. liv. 2).

13. But Clement has already advanced the theory that the Apostles had themselves everywhere appointed bishops and deacons, and had further given orders that after the death of those men others should be chosen in their place, who had been approved and designated by their predecessors.[3] That this is a theory, devised to meet an emergency that had arisen, appears from the vague and general character of the statement,[4] the reference to all Apostles,[5] and the attempt, which is not fully carried out, to give to the bishops the right of appointing their successors.[6] But we cannot here continue a further discussion of this deeply interesting passage. It is enough to take note here of the fact that the assumption that the Apostles, in accordance with the Old Testament example, had appointed persons to offices in the Churches, had already obtained currency in Rome by the end of the first century. But from the words of the Epistle of Clement, chap. xlii. 4: *Κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν,*

[1] See chaps. xl.–xliv.

[2] See chap. 15.

[3] See chap. xlii. 4 and xliv. 1 f.: *καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληγότες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους* (scil. *τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν*), *καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομὴν ἔδωκαν ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης*, etc.

[4] See chap. xlii. 4: *κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεις.*

[5] See chap. xlii. 1–4; xliv. 1 ff.

[6] See chap. xliv. 2, 3. The words will be found printed in full in a previous note.

δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν, we see clearly that this important conclusion rests upon the foundations of two simple historical facts. It is certainly quite true, in the first place,[1] that the first converts played an important part in the Church; and it is quite true, in the second place, that at the bidding of the Spirit persons were in olden times set apart to the discharge of special functions.[2] It may be concluded that from these two facts was deduced the belief of the end of the first century, that the Apostles, first of all as vehicles of the Holy Spirit, had been appointed to the first offices. The transition to this idea may be found in the notion that the Holy Spirit, as He appointed Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers for the Church universal, sent forth bishops and deacons into the particular Churches.[3] It is, however, important to observe that Clement maintained the Apostolic appointment even of deacons.

14. The holding of the office of bishop and deacon for life was for the first time maintained by Clement.[4] Still his Epistle shows that this was not invariably adhered to.

15. The office of bishop and deacon is described in the Epistle of Clement, that is, in the oldest document in which the subject is distinctly referred to, as having to do with the service or worship. The *Didaché* also gives a similar representation.[5]

16. That bishops and deacons also undertook the duties of Prophets and Teachers, that is, the preaching of the word, and thus were included in the same rank of honour as the Prophets and Teachers, is first of all affirmed in the *Didaché*.[6] In one of the old documentary sources of the

[1] Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 15 f.

[2] Comp. Acts xiii. 1 f.

[3] See Acts xiv. 23, and Clemens Alex., *Quis dives salv.*, cxlii.: Ἰωάννης . . . κλήρῳ ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ σημαινομένων. Also Acts xx. 28: ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους.

[4] See chap. xliv. 2.

[5] For further treatment of this point, see the second division of this paper.

[6] See chap. xv.

Apostolic Ordinances, dating from the middle of the second century, the *wish* is expressed that the bishop should be *παιδείας μέτοχος, δυνάμενος τὰς γραφὰς ἑρμηνεύειν*.[1] In 1 Tim. iii. 2 it is admitted to be desirable that he should be *διδακτικός*.

17. The expression *λαϊκός* is first found in the Epistle of Clement as the designation of all Church members who do not hold office.[2] The term *κλῆρος* for the rank or order of the office-bearers of the Church is first found—and then indeed in the plural, and not yet as a *term. technicus*—in 1 Pet. v. 3. As *terminus techn.*, it is not used, as far as I know, until the end of the second century.[3]

18. The distinction between *πρεσβύτεροι* and *νεώτεροι* in the Churches is first met with in 1 Pet. v. 1 f; and after that frequently, that is, soon after A.D. 64. Where *νέοι* or *νεώτεροι* are spoken of alongside of *πρεσβύτεροι*, we may, as a rule, regard the latter not as chosen persons, but as those who on account of their venerable age are entitled to honour and obedience.[4] Their function consists in exhortation.[5]

19. We meet with chosen or appointed Presbyters for the first time in the second century. The oldest witnesses for them are the Epistle of James,[6] the Acts of the Apostles,[7]

[1] See *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, p. 9 f.

[2] See chap. xl. 5.

[3] See Clemens Alex., *Quis dives salv.*, xlii.

[4] See 2 Clem. xvii. 3: *καὶ μὴ μόνον ἄρτι δοκώμεν πιστεύειν καὶ προσέχειν ἐν τῷ νουθετεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*.

[5] See 1 Pet. v. 5: *Νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις*; 1 Clem. i. 3: *ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν καὶ τιμὴν τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς παρ' ὑμῖν πρεσβυτέροις νέοις τε μέτρια καὶ σεμνὰ νοεῖν ἐπετρέπετε*. Also xxi. 6: *τοὺς προηγουμένους ἡμῶν ἀιδεσθῶμεν, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τιμήσωμεν, τοὺς νέους παιδεύσωμεν τὴν παιδείαν τοῦ φόβου τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Comp. iii. 3, and lvii. 1. Clement has as yet no idea of an ecclesiastical order of regularly appointed Presbyters. Obedience to the Presbyters is also enjoined in 2 Clem. xvii. 5.

[6] See chap. v. 14. This too is not to be understood of regularly appointed officers.

See chap. xiv. 23. I pass over what is said in the Acts of the Apostles about the Presbyters of Jerusalem. It seems to me very improbable that the Acts of the Apostles was written during the first century.

the Pastoral Epistles,[1] the original document of the so-called *Apostolic Ordinances*,[2] and the *Shepherd of Hermas*.[3]

20. That the Apostles ordained Presbyters is first stated in the Acts of the Apostles.[4] According to Titus i. 5, they were ordained by Titus, the disciple of the Apostle.

21. That the Presbyters are the rulers of the congregation is stated first in the Epistle of Peter, then in the *Shepherd of Hermas*.[5] Compare also the original document used in the *Apostolical Ordinances*.

22. That some of the Presbyter-rulers laboured also in word and doctrine, and so performed the same service as Prophets and Teachers, and many of the bishops and deacons (see above, No. 16), is distinctly stated in 1 Tim. v. 17. Compare 2 Clem. xvii. 5.

23. The earliest indication of the qualifications and functions of Presbyters is given in the documentary original source of the *Apostolical Ordinances*.[6]

24. The earliest indication of a privileged position for Presbyters in regard to judicial procedure is given in 1 Tim. v. 19: *κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου κατηγορίαν μὴ παραδέχου, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων.*

25. It is stated in 1 Clem., chap. xliv., the bishops and *deacons* were taken from the number of the "aged."

26. That the bishops (*episcopi*) were taken from and belonged to the ranks of the aged is also stated in Acts xx. 17, 28.

27. The *Shepherd of Hermas*, but especially the docu-

[1] See 1 Tim. v. 1, 2; ii. 17–19; Tit. i. 5. I regard the Pastoral Epistles as writings which, in their present form, were composed in the middle of the second century; but older documents are made use of in their composition.

[2] See *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, p. 10 ff.

[3] See *Vis.* ii. 4, 2, 3; iii. 1, 8.

[4] Acts xiv. 23.

[5] *Vis.* ii. 4, 3: *μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν προϊσταμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας.* 1 Tim. v. 17: *οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι.* Irenæus, quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 24: *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας.*

[6] See *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, pp. 10–17, 32–42. It is evident that they were inspectors, and had to superintend the exercise of discipline.

mentary source used in the *Apostolical Ordinances*,[1] presuppose a sort of *dyarchy* in the Church: on the one hand the Presbyter-rulers, and on the other hand bishops and deacons,[2]—leaving out of sight the Prophets and Teachers. The bishops preside over the worship and the distribution of gifts, but the Presbyters exercise control even over the bishops.

28. Yet according to that original document referred to, there are no longer in the Churches several bishops, but only one. The earliest witnesses for the monarchical episcopate, besides the one just named,[3] are found in Justin Martyr[4] and the Ignatian Epistles (about A.D. 140).

29. Ignatius is the first to advance the theory that the bishop is the representative of God to the Church, and that the Presbyters surround him as the Apostles surrounded Christ. Instead of a dyarchy, we have here for the first time a complete monarchy. The Presbyters are put under the bishop but are superior to the deacons. But still the deacons have always a special affinity to the bishop.[5]

30. The document used in the *Apostolical Ordinances* is the first to say that deacons may be advanced to the rank of bishops.[6]

[1] *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, pp. 32–42.

[2] The deacons are not "*ministri*," in the strict sense of the word, down to the middle of the second century. According to Clement they were chosen from the ranks of the Presbyters. Polycarp, Ep. v. 3, says that obedience is to be rendered unto them just as to the Presbyters; the author of the *Didaché*, chap. 15, counts them among those entitled to honour, and regards them as of one rank with the bishops; the original document used in the *Apostolical Ordinances* says, "that they should be treated by the Church with all honour respect, and fear" (*Texte*, etc., p. 21); Ignatius speaks of them with special warmth and cordiality.

[3] *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, p. 7 ff. [4] *Apolog.*, i. 69.

[5] Only in *one* passage are Presbyters and deacons mentioned together, Polyc. Ep. ad. Philipp. v. 3. But the Presbyters here named, to whom detailed exhortations are addressed in chap. vi., are in reality bishops. But Polycarp does not so name them because he, as belonging to Asia Minor, is willing to acknowledge and name only *one* bishop in each congregation. In Philippi, however, the monarchical episcopate had not yet been established.

[6] *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, 26, 48 f.

31. The same document expressly identifies for the first time the episcopal and the pastoral office.[1] But even in Eph. iv. 11, Acts xx. 28, and Hermas, Sim. ix. 31, by pastors are to be understood bishops.

32. Deaconesses are first mentioned in the Epistle of Pliny to Trajan.

33. There were *readers* in the Churches at latest by the end of the second century.[2] Exorcists were in existence still earlier.

34. The first instance of distant congregations decidedly taking to do with the condition of other congregations occurs in the case of Clement, who writes his letter from Rome about A.D. 96. The oldest witness to bishops discussing in personal conference debated questions, is found in the journey of Polycarp to Anicetus at Rome. The earliest accounts of episcopal synods proceed from Asia Minor, during the time of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus.

35. The theory that the bishops appointed by the Apostles are successors of the Apostles and discharge the apostolic office, is first found in Irenæus. I refrain from adding more to this chronological review. It will show more convincingly than many words could do, that the episcopal theory is not correct, but that also the assumption is wrong that the ecclesiastical constitution has been developed out of an original presbyterial constitution. The development has been very complicated, because the forces under whose influence the Churches stood were from the first numerous, and because the Churches themselves were not merely religious sects, but also social bodies in the most comprehensive sense of the word.[3]

[1] *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, 13, 26.

[2] See my Excursus on the Origin of the Readership, in *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, 57 ff. It is of special importance to observe that the source used by the so-called *Apostolical Ordinances*, which is one of the oldest witnesses for the arrangement that gives but one bishop, has enumerated along with Presbyters, —Readers, Deacons, and Widows.

[3] Dr. Sanday remarks at p. 103 f that I have made the separation between

II. On the Original Nature of the Episcopal Office.

Dr. Sanday has treated in an interesting manner of the name and office of the ἐπίσκοπος.[1] I shall not directly combat what is there said, but I am not disposed to assign any special significance to the LXX. in this connexion. It is in general certainly quite proper to attempt the derivation of Christian institutions, as far as this can be done, from the Old Testament and from Judaism. But it appears to me that in this case this way is not available, because the designation ἐπίσκοπος undoubtedly emerged from a purely Gentile Christian ground. The primitive bishops may certainly be compared in many respects with the *Archisynagogi;*[2] but the name Archisynagogus is not found in the Gentile Christian Churches, and the name bishop is not found among the Jews. It would be well therefore, in the

the bishop and the presbyter too great. In this connection he refers to Acts xx. 17, 28; 1 Pet. v. 1 f; Tit. i. 6–7; and the Epistle of Clement. But Acts xx. 17, 28, says only that the bishops appointed by the Holy Ghost were at the same time Presbyters, which I have never denied. 1 Pet. v. 1 f refers to age, and the reading ἐπισκοποῦντες has not been established. Tit. i. 5–7 I cannot accept as a valid proof, because I believe that i. 7–9 was interpolated into the received text by the redactor. See Otto Ritschl, *Theol. Lit. Ztg.*, 1885, No. 25. Finally, as to the Epistle of Clement, I would refer to my brief notes on it above, as also to Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeitalter.*, p. 637 ff. Weizsäcker had formerly believed in the complete identity of Presbyters and bishops (see *Theol. Lit. Zeitg.*, 1883, No. 19); but he has been convinced by my treatises. He now writes: "The view hitherto prevalent that bishops and Presbyters were the same is no longer satisfactory. It is right only in so far as the former are taken from the Presbyters and do not in their very nature conssitute a superior rank. But the theory is wrong that the same persons are sometimes called Presbyters and sometimes Bishops, though often this is apparently so." This appearance is in my opinion strongest in the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians. But even if one should demonstrate from this passage that there were no bishops in Philippi (see on the contrary Paul's Ep. to the Phil. i. 1), this would really prove nothing. Why Polycarp has not named bishops, I have endeavoured to explain above. It is well known, too, that Irenæus here called the bishops "the ancients," or the elders. I will not deny that in many small congregations at the beginning those who were recognised as presbyters would be one and the same with the bishops.

[1] Expositor for Feb., pp. 98–103.

[2] See Schürer, *Hist. of Jew. Peo. in Time of Chr.*, Div. ii., p. 63 ff. Edin., 1885.

first instance, to look away from the Jewish constitution and the Old Testament.

But also researches into the etymology of the word ἐπίσκοπος or inquiries about the place and character of such an office in civil constitutions do not afford any solution of the problem. No other meaning can be given to the word than that of "overseer"; but what sort of an oversight such overseers exercised cannot be more precisely determined. Further, whether a parallel can be insisted upon between the ecclesiastical overseers and the civil or municipal overseers, can only be determined after one has already learnt the special functions of the ecclesiastical overseers. Hence the only true method of investigation is to consider carefully the oldest passages in early Christian literature, in which we not only meet with the name bishop, but also a statement of his functions. This we shall attempt in the remainder of this paper.

I. 1. In Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, bishops are named in the address. What their functions are is not stated. The entire Epistle, however, makes it probable that they were named because they had to do with the sending of the contribution. But this was a present from the whole congregation. The contribution, however, could only have been raised in the congregational assembly, and stood in immediate connection with the delivery of gifts by the congregation. Thus it is probable that the bishops were overseers in regard to the congregational rendering of gifts.

I. 2. The Epistle of Clement was written in order to obviate disturbances in the Corinthian Church. These troubles are characterized generally as a revolt of the younger against the elder,[1] but specially as a contention about the episcopal office.[2] In chap. xl.–xliv. this office

[1] See chap. iii. 3; xlvii. 6; liv. 2; lvii. 1.

[2] See chap. xliv. 1: οἱ ἀποστόλοι ἔγνωσαν, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς.

of bishop (and deacon) is now more exactly defined as indeed exclusively one that had to do with the worship; the bishops and deacons correspond to the Old Testament priests and Levites. They are charged with maintaining the unity of the Church in worship. The congregation is under obligation to assemble only where the bishops and deacons are. They have to see that everything is done *κατὰ τάξιν*. Their service is a *λειτουργία*.[1] But this *λειτουργία* is more exactly described as *προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι* (chap. xl. 2), or as *ποιεῖν προσφοράς* (xl. 4), or as *προσφέρειν θυσίας* (xli. 2), or as a *προσφέρειν* in a particular place (xli. 3), or finally, in the most definite way as a *προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα*.[2] In the last named passage this phrase is expressly given as indicating the *contents* of the *ἐπισκοπή*, that is, of the office of bishop. No other particular, however, in regard to the functions of the bishop is to be found in the whole range of the epistle. Hence there can be no doubt that according to the Epistle of Clement the bishops preside over the worship, the function of the bishop is *προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα*. But such an office may be described as that of an overseer, because all the believers bring their gifts. This contributing the bishops have to superintend in order to present the gifts unto God. Because they are the offerers *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, they are honoured with a ministerial office (xliv. 6), and have a definite place assigned them in the Church (xliv. 5).

I. 3. The same result is obtained from the *Didaché*, for the subject of the 14th chap. is the offering of the congregation (*θυσία*). This is immediately succeeded by the

[1] See chap. xl. 2, 5; xli. 1; xliv. 2, 6. *Λειτουργός*, xli. 2; *Λειτουργεῖν*, xliii. 4; xliv. 3.

[2] Chap. xliv. 3 f.: *Τοὺς οὖν . . . λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡσύχως καὶ ἀβαναύσως, μεμαρτορημένους τε πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ πάντων, τούτους οὐ δικαίως νομίζομεν ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας· ἁμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενεγκόντας τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν.*

words (15, 1): *Χειροτονήσατε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους.* This *οὖν* proves that bishops (and deacons) should be appointed *because* in the Church an offering is made on Sunday. But when it is made the most particular qualification of these bishops that they be *ἀφυλάργοροι*, it follows for this requirement that the bishops, in regard to the gifts brought by the congregation, had generally to receive and to distribute them. This is in perfect agreement with what we have examined in reference to the Epistle to the Philippians.

I. 4. In the original document used in the so-called *Apostolic Ordinances* the bishop appears as the director of the worship, who stands at the altar (*παρεδρεύουσι τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ*). The presbyters have to assist them in the worship. He is the *μύστης*, they are the *συμμυσταί*. He appears further as caring for the poor, and must therefore be *φιλόπτωχος*. Finally, he is the representative of the Church to those who are without. All these functions form a unity. The bishop is the head of the Church engaged in worship, and in so far as he is such, he is also the administrator of the finances of the Church: he is its business head, and its head toward those without. But—so strictly are the qualifications determined—in regard to order, discipline, and jurisdiction, he is yet not the sovereign head. In this connection he rather stands himself under the supervision (*προνοία*) of the council of Presbyters.[1]

I. 5. Even in the *Shepherd of Hermas* bishops are still strictly distinguished from the Presbyters. In the only two passages in which they are referred to their functions are not directly mentioned (*Vis.* iii. 5. 1; *Sim.* ix. 27. 2). But when it is said in the latter passage: *Ἐπίσκοποι καὶ φιλόξενοι, οἵτινες ἡδέως εἰς τοὺς οἴκους ἑαυτῶν πάντοτε ὑπεδέξαντο τοὺς δούλους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνευ ὑποκρίσεως; οἱ δὲ ἐπίσκοποι πάντοτε τοὺς ὑστερημένους καὶ τὰς χήρας τῇ διακονίᾳ ἑαυτῶν*

[1] This is more fully treated in *Texte und Untersuch.*, ii. 5, pp. 32–42.

ἀδιαλείπτως ἐσκέπασαν καὶ ἀγνῶς ἀνεστράφησαν πάντοτε,—one side of their activity is made prominent which would necessarily be soon developed out of their functions in regard to worship (see above, the φιλοπτωχός). Justin, too, described bishops to the Emperor as directors of the worship and ministers to the poor.

These most ancient witnesses are in my opinion beyond question. Bishops are originally the directors of the worship, the offerers κατ' ἐξοχήν. They are called overseers insomuch as they direct or superintend the assembly met for worship. Out of this function all others have been necessarily developed. There have naturally grown out of this: (1) the administration of the gifts generally; (2) the administration of the property of the congregation; (3) the charge of the poor and needy; (4) the care of visitors and strangers; (5) the representing of the Church to those without. In performing their service in connection with worship, they necessarily and in increasing measure had to proclaim the word of God and edify the Church.

So began they, as the *Didaché* says, "to perform the service of Prophets and Teachers." At the first the function of the Presbyters was sharply distinguished from this service. They were the persons of authority; they exhorted the young and sinners; they were honoured and obeyed. Even in public worship, where the bishops presided, the presbyters had to step forward if disorders or disturbances arose, and they had to superintend the distribution of gifts,—at least in the Churches from the midst of which the source used by the *Apostolical Ordinances* proceeded. Besides their exhortations, too, under certain circumstances they wrought ἐν λογῷ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ. But already their future over against that of bishops was an uncertain one, because bishops themselves were taken from them, or at least in respect of honour were reckoned among them. These had, therefore, a διπλῆ τιμή, and so the Presbyters were of neces-

sity gradually brought into a subordinate position, especially after they had assumed the position of "Teachers."

II. Until, however, this had taken place the relation of the two was necessarily a vacillating one. It cannot be denied that the functions of presbyters and bishops were not always distinguished *in praxi*, nor could be. This is shown perhaps most strikingly in the use of the term ποιμήν (ποιμαίνειν). It might as well be used of the bishops as of the presbyters. In the Epistle to the Ephesians bishops are indeed to be understood by pastors.[1] It is so undoubtedly in Acts xx. 28: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. On the other hand, the elders of 1 Pet. v. 1, who are set over against the younger members, are designated shepherds.[2] In the Epistle of Clement (liv. 2) the Pastor and Presbyter are named together;[3] but the καθεστάμενοι πρεσβύτεροι (xliv.) are most probably the bishops and deacons. In the *Shepherd of Hermas* (*Sim.* ix. 31) the *pastores* are not to be identified with the bishops. But quite certainly in the source used in the *Apostolical Ordinances* the bishop is called ὁ ποιμήν, and the episcopal office ὁ ποιμενικὸς τόπος. So too we read in the old document at the basis of the *Apostolical Constitutions*: τὸν ποιμένα τὸν καθιστάμενον (Bk. ii. 1). No sure conclusion can be drawn from the use of so general a word as ποιμήν. But I trust that the proofs advanced above about the original functions of bishops are so certain that it will not be necessary to question Jews or Gentiles in order to learn what was the original nature of the episcopal office.

ADOLF HARNACK.

[1] Eph. iv. 11: ἀπόστολοι, προφῆται, εὐαγγελισταί, ποιμένες, διδάσκαλοι. The *Shepherd of Hermas* mentions ἐπίσκοποι in the place where ποιμένες are named in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

[2] Πρεσβυτέρους ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ . . . ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. But it is worthy of notice that in this Epistle (ii. 25) Christ is called ὁ ποιμὴν καὶ ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν.

[3] Τὸ ποίμνιον μετὰ τῶν καθεσταμένων πρεσβυτέρων.

HAGGAI.

When Cyrus, king of Elam, and conqueror of Media and Persia, overthrew Nabonidos, and made Babylon the seat of his empire, one of his first acts was to liberate the Jewish captives and encourage them to return to their own land. This he did for purposes of State. As his dominions extended he saw the necessity of attaching subject nations to his government by gratitude and self-interest. He also perceived that in operating against Egypt it would be of great importance to have Judæa as a secure base of these operations. But the vast majority of the Jews preferred to remain in exile. Already the race had learned its adaptability and power to outstrip other races, even on their own soil. Already many of them, such as Daniel, had won their way to posts they could not abandon. Many had acquired property they were disinclined to sell, had originated business they could not transfer, had formed connexions they could not easily sunder. Besides, the grandeur of Babylon fascinated them. Its gates had indeed been thrown open to the conqueror. It was not, after all, impregnable. But this one misadventure could not delete from the Jewish mind the impression that in all the world there was no magnificence comparable to that of Babylon. To abandon its thronged and affluent streets, its gay gardens, its stupendous buildings, its busy river lined with quays and storehouses, its secure and easy ways of living, and to betake themselves through many perils to the ruins of a small town overgrown with grass, its entire trade destroyed, the country round it at all times hilly and barren, and now utterly waste, was a course of conduct which, considering what human nature is, was not likely to be adopted by any large number of men.

That 42,360 men with their dependants availed themselves of the decree of Cyrus, and returned to their own

land, is a strong testimony to the intense hold which the fatherland asserts over some races, and also to the belief which many Jews still held that there awaited their race a glorious destiny, and that this destiny must be accomplished in their own land. Long captivity had not in all the Jews deadened the spirit of freemen. Their psalmist, even among strangers, and though the brand of the slave was upon him, exclaimed, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let skill depart from my right hand; if I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." The man who thus nobly preferred to hang his harp on the willow that seemed to droop its head and weep in sympathy with the exile, rather than desecrate his art by making it the pander to profane mirth, who imprecated upon himself the loss of his gifts of art and song if his heart should prove unfaithful to Him who gave them, is a type of man who reminds us how much salt remained among the Jews in their most corrupt times. Rare indeed among us is this pathetic fidelity to our true home; rare this noble scorn of "them that waste us" when we are invited to use, for the purpose of ingratiating ourselves with the influential, or promoting the unworthy pleasure of the worldly, gifts entrusted to us for accomplishing purposes that are Divine. Too common among us is a slavish contentment to remain in well-fed exile, with little earnest craving to return to the presence and dwelling of God, and little hardy and daring ambition to go where alone our destiny as God's children can be worked out.

Dreary enough was all that met the eye of those who returned; and never had men more need of faith. They saw the houses weather-worn and in decay, the once trim gardens undistinguishable, the wide cornfields lying like unreclaimed land. And when at length they reached what had been Jerusalem, and walked in over the crumbled

walls, the young people, who had been told of its glories, must have exclaimed in disappointment, as their eyes rested on gables blackened with fire, the Temple demolished, everywhere heaps of ruins. It seemed unreasonable to expect that out of their small numbers a nation could grow, or that out of these piles of grass-grown and beast-haunted ruins a fair and prosperous city should arise. Still, when the first shock had spent itself, and they had time to reflect that this was actually the land in which all the great deeds of their fathers had been done; when they found themselves standing where David and Solomon had stood; when with their own eyes they saw one after another of those historic scenes on which the fancy, the patriotism, the godliness of their childhood had been nursed; and when they felt that to be free under any conditions is better than to be captive under any,—they must have felt a thrill of unaccustomed joy and have gladly joined with their choir of two hundred singing men and singing women as they sang, "When the Lord brought back the captivity of Zion, we were as men that dream."

Their difficulties however were by no means over when they reached Jerusalem. In the first year of Cyrus, the year 538 B.C., they celebrated their return by erecting an altar of burnt offering, and shortly after made preparations for rebuilding the Temple and the city walls. But their contemptuous rejection of the proffered aid of the Samaritans roused the jealousy of that mongrel race, whose leaders so misrepresented matters at the court of Cyrus that further building was interdicted. It was not to be expected that Jewish affairs should receive any attention from his successor, the eccentric or mad Cambyses, still less from the usurping Smerdis; but no sooner was Darius Hystaspis firmly seated on the throne than the men who understood the times perceived that the Jews' opportunity had arrived. Roused by Haggai and Zechariah, Zerubbabel took heart

and resumed the work of rebuilding Temple and city in the second year of Darius (B.C. 520), and in less than four years the top-stone of the Temple was built in amid the acclamations of men who felt themselves once more a nation.

The men who take the initiative in a national crisis such as this must have words to utter which, however flat they may appear to us, are well adapted to the occasion. And the probability is, that in these brief remains of the prophets we have but one or two specimens of a ceaseless activity and persistent determination which upheld and animated the whole people till the work was accomplished. It was not an easy task they took in hand. The return from exile had its dark as well as its bright side. It was a second exodus, from which the nation might be expected to start with a cleansed path and a new purpose. But as in the individual life, the chastened penitent, purified as his spirit may be, has in some cases no longer the material or the physical means of showing what this life should be: so the Jewish nation, purged as it was from idolatry, had yet lost its opportunity, and henceforth drags out a poor and insignificant career, in great part unrecorded, and with barely one great man to the century. The great result of the succeeding five centuries probably was that the hopes of the true Israel became spiritualized. At all events, this inglorious period paved the way for the ultimate acceptance of a spiritual Messiah, and not an earthly monarch. And whatever was the result, there is no doubt of the fact that, from the period of the exile, things have no longer the old life and glory among the Jews. To the whole national state the question of Haggai was relevant: "Who is left among you that saw this house in its first glory? And how do ye see it now? Is it not in your eyes in comparison as nothing?"

This changed aspect of affairs was felt to be most discouraging. It is a sad thing, people feel, to be going back

in the world, to be put to shame by the very ruins of our forefathers' works. It is sad for a nation, once the arbiter among the rest, to be now despised and overlooked as insignificant in any great question or contest. It is sad to visit lands which once gave law to the world in art or literature, and find the present inhabitants unable so much as to appreciate the works of their ancestors. It is sad for an individual to become aware that age, instead of bringing him nearer to perfect attainment, is carrying him away from it into destitution, difficulties, feebleness, and failure. It called therefore for boldness on Haggai's part to affirm in the face of the old men, who knew what a change had taken place, that the glory of the house he summoned them to build would be greater than that of Solomon's Temple. Yet if a just estimate of God and His glory had at all found entrance into their minds they might be prepared to believe in their future; for God ever goes forward and not back, accommodating Himself to the world He works in, and passing from stage to stage of progress, never so baffled that He is forced to suspend progress, but always leading His people on to something higher than they have yet attained. Often indeed progress is not apparent. Like these Jews, old men are for ever weeping that the world is not what it was, that a glory has passed from it. These Jews knew what their glory had been in times past, and the new and higher glory of this second Temple, being different from what they had before known, they could not recognise as glory at all. So it is always. When the special glory or privilege of a generation passes away, there are many to lament its decay, but few to recognise the higher good to which it has given birth and which now takes its place. Be it ours to have faith in God, to believe that He goes on. The work we have to do may reflect no great glory on those who do it; but it may, and by God's blessing it will, be a step onwards. Let us not think

meanly of our own generation. It also has a place in the history of God's purposes and work in the world.

To inspire the people with energetic hopefulness was Haggai's object. And standing among the abandoned foundations of the Temple, he cries to those around him, "The latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former, saith the Lord of hosts"; and in what this greater glory was to consist he explains by adding, "In this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts." Any outward glory the building might have was to be merely suggestive of the real glory that attends God's presence. The Church can at no time compete with the world in what is distinctively the glory of the world. The Golden House of Nero ever eclipses Solomon's Temple. The raising of large sums of money, the adoption of high-sounding ecclesiastical titles, the maintenance of striking services, the glitter of processions variegated with picturesque and gorgeous dresses and banners, the employment of political and social influence—all such things merely exhibit the Church as a kind of second-rate world. The spiritual men among the Jews were drawn to the Temple because they were men like ourselves, often feeling forlorn and strangers upon earth, and seeking a Father's dwelling-place. Tortured by the temptations to which their circumstances gave rise, and by the disappointing wickedness of their own hearts, the prey of gnawing anxieties and doubts, feeling keenly that the mere possession of their own land was far from giving them true settlement of spirit, they found in the dwelling of God the peace they longed for. Where God manifests Himself as dwelling with men to bless and keep them, there peace abides. It is peace that Christ brought by bringing the Father among us, and by revealing His forgiveness, His purpose to lift us out of all sin, His identification of Himself with us. He who believes in Christ as the revelation of God enters into peace.

But how was this glory of God's dwelling to be reached? How was even the external building to be erected? It was through utter discouragement, through interdict and withdrawal of countenance on the part of their rulers, and through the opposition of their neighbours, that they had abandoned the works; how should they resume them? This second exodus they had found markedly different from the first. No pillar of cloud and fire had guided their return; no easy discomfiture of foes, no supernatural supply of their wants, had encouraged them. On the contrary, they were a derision and a hissing to those that saw them. Nothing seemed to thrive with them. Their crops failed; the money carefully amassed in Babylon was rapidly spent at home. They might justly question whether God was blessing the enterprise.

At this juncture come Haggai's words: "I am with you, according to the word that I covenanted with you, when ye came out of Egypt, so My spirit remaineth among you; fear ye not." This was great encouragement indeed. It was great encouragement to these returned exiles to know that, notwithstanding all that had come and gone since the Exodus, they might serve themselves heirs to all the promise and hope of that glorious time. All men have to learn that, not upon their steadfast will and consecrated life does the world depend for its redemption from evil, but upon God's faithfulness to His original purpose. We fail; we utterly forfeit our right to put a hand to any holy work; we earn banishment and exile, loss of influence, and of all true fellowship with God: but every one who penitently and humbly seeks again to advance any good thing is met by God's forgiveness and countenance. This is the strength of all who see good that needs to be done and are striving to do it, that God is with them, consistent with Himself, ever bearing things onwards towards a righteous end, and carrying with Him all who labour in that cause.

This fundamental encouragement is flanked by the further assurance that the means required for the work will not be wanting. "The silver is Mine, and the gold is Mine, saith the Lord of hosts." That is to say, the silver and the gold at present held by those who are not thinking of this work, the money not as yet available for it, the means which must be forthcoming if the work is to go on, but of which at present there is no offer, promise, or sign—all this is Mine. It is now held by men, some of them niggardly, some of them resolved upon other investments, some of them unaware that this work is going on; it is held by persons who look upon it as theirs, and who are destining it to uses of their own: but it is really Mine, and what you need I will give. The work I wish to see done I have the means of doing. Your part is to determine if the work is needed, and to seek the means in legitimate ways. Visionary as such a statement may seem, abundant and remarkable verifications of it occur continually: verifications which, it must be confessed, make it extremely difficult to redd the marches between faith and imprudence.

Money however is by no means all that is required for furthering good work upon earth. Therefore God promises other requisites as well. "I will shake all nations, and all that the nations count desirable shall be brought." Very slowly indeed is this being fulfilled. Indications of fulfilment may be detected here and there; but that is all. The highest art of southern Europe has at times been consecrated to Christian uses. The enterprise, the zeal for exploration and discovery, which chiefly characterize northern Europe, has helped forward the cause of freedom and religion. By many social changes and by some political movements the best interests of humanity are served. How far social reform and national law can help to make men moral is a question not to be settled without debate and explanation. That men cannot be made Christian by

compulsion needs not to be insisted on. But men can be restrained from outward acts of immorality; and it will scarcely be doubted that if through three or four generations of a nation's life some forms of immorality were made impossible, the tendency towards such immorality would be enormously lessened. And if a nation represses crimes which *directly* injure the life and property of the citizens, it is difficult to see why it may not assume or exercise the right to repress such vices as indirectly but most seriously affect that life and property.

But Haggai was aware that the reluctance to build arose largely from discontent with their lot. Their harvests had been poor; they could earn little, and what they did earn seemed to go into a bag with holes. They had sacrificed, but no response in providence was apparent. The smoke ascended regularly from the altar of burnt offering, but their fields were barren as ever. Why then rebuild the Temple? If no good came of sacrificing, why sacrifice?

Their past want of success Haggai explains by a parable. They thought their prayers and sacrifices should have compensated for their neglect of the great work of rebuilding the Temple. Haggai shows them that this neglect had contaminated all they did. A holy thing, such as a priest's skirt, does not communicate its holiness to what is unclean, does not purify it. On the contrary, what is unholy or unclean does communicate its uncleanness to all it touches. A single decayed apple, left in a basket of sound fruit, will not be turned into a fresh apple by the soundness of the rest, but will propagate its own rottenness through the whole basketful. One drop of dirty water will taint a whole glassful that was fresh and pure. Similarly when a bad man engages in a good work, it does not purify him, but he defiles it. The Jews, like the great mass of mankind, thought their sacrifices and services would compensate for their sloth, and cleanse their evil lives. They declined

to see that their prime duty was to rebuild the Temple, and that while that remained undone prayers and sacrifices were defiled and an abomination to God. They persuaded themselves the time for building had not come. They magnified the least obstacle, and construed it as an intimation in providence that for the present the work should be suspended. They found opportunity for the elaborate decoration of their own houses. No Samaritan intrigues were allowed to put a stop to that. But a slight rise in the price of timber, a wet season, the sight of a Samaritan a mile from the walls was enough to make them despair of getting God's house finished. And yet they wondered that God did not answer their prayers, and respond to their sacrifices with manifold blessings.

Haggai by his parable showed them that their religious services did not compensate for their neglect, but that, on the contrary, their lack of zeal for God had vitiated all their sacrifices and prayers. Holy services do not cleanse unholy persons. The inward repentance which discovers and repairs neglected duty can alone do that. Your niggardliness, says Haggai, is the source of your poverty. To the churl God shows Himself inexorable and unkind. To the liberal man God shows Himself liberal. Read, says Haggai, the lessons of your own experience. Look back, and recognise that all your misery has come of your neglect of prime duties. Your prayers have been unheard, because you remained impenitent and would not attempt these duties. But from this very day, on which your repentance expresses itself in duty recognised and performed, your prayers will receive abundant answer. Note this day; there is as yet no natural sign, no rich blossom, no augury of the fields by which any one could predict a good harvest; "the seed is yet in the barn, the vine, the fig tree, the pomegranate, the olive, have none of them blossomed," but "from this day will I bless you." The sure omen of good to you is your

laying the foundation of the Temple. From this day, when you faithfully own duty and unselfishly discharge it, you will find God in the midst of you.

Let the idea, then, that religious services sanctify common life, and atone for daily transgression and neglect, be numbered among exploded superstitions. The person who offers the service gives character to the service: and if the person is unholy and impenitent, the service is insulting and impious. To come into God's presence conscious that we have sinned, heartily repentant, and eagerly purposing amendment, is acceptable to God. But to offer to God something that is called religious service, and to do so under a vague impression that this service somehow atones for or covers up the blemishes, the shortcomings, the selfishness of our life, is both ignorant and wicked.

Let it also be understood that frequently God is waiting for us to act, when we are waiting for Him. If we have not been prospering, if our affairs have mysteriously been going back, if loss has followed loss notwithstanding our efforts and prayers, if there seems to be some insuperable barrier to our moral growth, it is very possible this may result from some neglected duty, which convicts us of disloyalty to God. The crime of these Jews was that they put themselves first, God second. They never doubted they had a perfect right to make themselves comfortable, in the first place; and if there should be a surplus for which they could find no use, that might be given to God. It is thus men destroy their spiritual prosperity, and find themselves becoming heartless in prayer, and conscious that the life has gone out of their religion. To such Haggai's message is: Try a new course; do not think so much of your own comfort, but be bountiful Godwards. Take note of the day you begin to do so, and you will find that from that very day things begin to go better with you.

MARCUS DODS.

THE PROPHECY CONCERNING JUDAS.

Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἔδει πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφὴν ἣν προεῖπε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυεὶδ περὶ Ἰούδα τοῦ γενομένου ὁδηγοῦ τοῖς συλλαβοῦσιν Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἔλαχεν τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης. οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκτήσατο χωρίον, ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας, καὶ πρηνὴς γενόμενος ἐλάκησεν μέσος, καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ· καὶ γνωστὸν ἐγένετο πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἰερουσαλήμ, ὥστε κληθῆναι τὸ χωρίον ἐκεῖνο τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν Ἀκελδαμάχ, τοῦτ' ἔστιν, Χωρίον Αἵματος· γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν Βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν

γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ ἔρημος
καὶ μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ.

καί

τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λαβέτω ἕτερος.

δεῖ οὖν τῶν . . .

—Acts i. 16–21.

16 Brethren, it was needful that the scripture should be fulfilled, which the
Holy Ghost spake before by the mouth of David concerning Judas, who was
17 guide to them that took Jesus. For he was numbered among us, and received
18 his portion in this ministry. (Now this man obtained a field with the reward
of his iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all
19 his bowels gushed out. And it became known to all the dwellers at Jerusalem;
insomuch that in their language that field was called Akeldama, that is, The
20 field of blood.) For it is written in the book of Psalms,

Let his habitation be made desolate,
And let no man dwell therein:

and,

His office let another take.

21 Of the men therefore . . . . . .
22 . . . must . . .

—Acts i. 16–22 (Rev. Ver.).

The rendering given of this passage by the Revisers must be a subject of grave regret to all who have any regard for the credit of English scholarship. It does not represent the Greek. It is not English. It is not sense. The first two statements are capable of demonstration, the third must of course be a matter of opinion, but will, I trust, be sufficiently justified by me, and indeed is a fair corollary from the other two.

I. Faithfulness to the original is claimed by the Revisers as their great virtue: Dr. Westcott (Expositor, Feb., 1887) refers to "their continuous effort to give in the Revision an exact representation of the original text." Let us see

how they observe this rule. Peter's speech falls naturally into two halves: omitting the formal ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί the first word of the speech is ἔδει, and the first word of the second half is δεῖ: "It was necessary . . . It is necessary . . ." The position of the words marks them as emphatic words, as guiding words and as connected words. The fact is as clear as the sun at noonday. Yet the Revisers render ἔδει "it was needful," and δεῖ by an insignificant "must," which they proceed to bury out of sight by removing it from its position as first word of the sentence and making it the forty-second. Beyond all argument this is definite misrepresentation of the Greek: it is rendered impossible for an English reader to form a just opinion of Luke's meaning.

II. Verse 17 is not a sentence, although it is punctuated as one. "For he was numbered with us" is not a sentence: "It was necessary that the scripture should be fulfilled which was spoken concerning Judas, because he was numbered with us" is a sentence, and is what Luke wrote.

Again in verse 20, "For it is written . . ." is punctuated as a sentence. This is a crowning absurdity. Remove verses 18 and 19 (for being marked as a parenthesis they may be removed without affecting the construction) and this is what the Revisers produce as a specimen of English:

"It was needful that the scripture should be fulfilled . . . concerning Judas, who was guide to them that took Jesus. For he was numbered among us, and received his portion in this ministry. For it is written, Let his habitation be desolate."

In the range of English literature is there a passage comparable to this?

III. As regards the sense, the Revisers' view seems to be that verses 18, 19 are an explanatory addition inserted by Luke in the middle of Peter's speech. This view doubt-

less rests on the observation that the words τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν cannot have been used by Peter, and, as the whole of these verses refers to historical facts, the facile inference has been drawn that the whole of them is a parenthesis inserted by the historian. Before explaining the real sense of the passage it is necessary to state the fatal objections to this method of taking it.

(*a*) As exhibited by the Revisers the Greek words assigned to Peter are 98. Of these 59 are in the first half of the speech, which refers to the past and to Judas. Of this number again 17 are actual quotation and 6 words necessary to introduce the quotation. Not counting ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, the words in which Peter expresses his judgment about Judas are thus reduced to 34. Yet we are asked to believe that Luke in relating a speech of Peter's, to which he evidently attaches great importance (cf. the special emphasis of the introductory words ἀναστὰς ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν), after quoting 34 words of Peter's, introduces an explanatory parenthesis of his own, consisting of not less than 40 words. As a mere question of literary criticism it is impossible that such a violation of all proportion should occur in a writer of such undoubted literary skill as Luke. Moreover it may be noted that, combined with the remarkable brevity which Peter's speech thus assumes, there is an equally remarkable fulness of expression. He does not say merely "the scripture," but "the scripture which the Holy Spirit spake before by the mouth of David": Judas is described as "Judas who made himself guide to them that took Jesus": the reference to his position as an apostle is given with rhetorical amplitude in two shapes, "he was numbered with us," and "he obtained the lot of this ministry." This brevity and this fulness are hard to reconcile.

(*b*) The particles μὲν οὖν cannot introduce a parenthesis. They certainly do not do so elsewhere in the Acts, in which

they occur very frequently.[1] They are particles of transition common in narration. As often, when introduced at the beginning of a paragraph or narrative, μέν has nothing formally to answer to it: the sentence takes another shape and the formal antithesis is lost. A real antithesis however there always must be. A writer or speaker cannot begin with οὗτος μέν without having some antithesis in his mind, as here Peter, when he says "he on the one hand met an awful death," has before his mind the antithesis "but we have to supply the vacancy so caused." If however verses 18, 19 form a parenthesis, then within that parenthesis it is impossible to supply or imagine an antithesis to οὗτος μέν. "He on the one hand purchased a field, . . . and died, . . . and it became known"—this is the parenthesis which the Revisers make Luke introduce. As a schoolmaster I see much bad Greek composition, and I know this particular μέν, which means nothing, intimately: it is very frequent in boys' iambics *metri gratia*, but it is wholly unknown to any Greek author I am acquainted with, and indeed is impossible where language is used for the expression of living thought. See Lightfoot, on Col. ii. 23.

(*c*) As Alford points out, the style of these verses is distinctly rhetorical, and not such as would be adopted in an explanatory parenthesis. οὗτος is emphatic, and draws marked attention to the person and character of Judas: "He then—he, the traitor Apostle, of whom the Holy Spirit spake beforehand." Compare the similar use of οὗτος in

[1] Prof. Lumby says: "μὲν οὖν. These particles at the opening of the verse show that there is a break in the continuity of the narrative, and that verses 18 and 19 must be taken for a parenthesis. For examples of such use of μὲν οὖν cf. v. 41, xiii. 4, xxiii. 22, xvi. 9." In each of these cases however the particles do exactly the reverse of what Prof. Lumby states; they help to continue the narrative, and do not "break its continuity" or introduce a "parenthesis." The link which connects two things is not usually described as a "break of continuity."

speeches as first word of a sentence, Acts iv. 11 and v. 31.[1] Again the words ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδίκιας, "with the pay of his guilt," "with the blood-money," are instinct with passionate scorn. Consider too the graphic horror of ἐλάκησεν μέσος, καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ. Meyer rightly characterizes ἐλάκησεν as "rednerisch starker Ausdruck." The whole passage breathes the spirit not of didactic explanation but of living oratory.

(*d*) Lastly—and this is the strongest argument—if these verses be a parenthesis, it is impossible to explain Peter's speech. The words are essential to Peter's chain of reasoning; without them it is unintelligible. That this is so may be seen by observing the difficulties of editors who accept the parenthesis theory. Three editions are before me, those of Bishop Wordsworth, Mr. Humphry, and Prof. Lumby. They all accept the parenthesis theory, and in consequence have two difficulties to face: the first how to explain ὅτι in verse 17, the second to show for what purpose Peter introduces the quotation from Ps. lxix. 25, "Let his habitation be made desolate, and let no man dwell therein."

As regards the first, Prof. Lumby is silent: he finds ὅτι so simple that he has nothing to say about it. Bishop Wordsworth does not find it so easy, and gives three explanations side by side without indicating which he considers correct.

"ὅτι] *because* He was their ὁδηγὸς, or *leader; because* being one of us 'he knew the place' (John xviii. 2) where, and the time when, He might be taken; and *because* it had been prophesied that one of His familiar friends should betray Christ. Ps. xli. 9."

Of these explanations the first passes my understanding —Judas was their ὁδηγὸς "*because* He was their ὁδηγός." The second entirely alters Peter's fervid words and reduces

[1] Note in illustration the scornful power of the pronoun in Scott's famous lines:

"Where shall the traitor rest,
He, the deceiver . . . ?"

them to a trivial and unnecessary remark—Judas was their guide "*because* being one of us he knew the place." The third comes very near the truth, but the reference to Ps. xli. 9 is wrong, as the 'scripture' which Peter describes as fulfilled can only be the one he subsequently quotes. Mr. Humphry takes a course of his own, and boldly renders ὅτι "although." This is a simple and effective solution of the difficulty: it consists in removing the word found in the text and replacing it by a word of exactly opposite meaning. Luke states that something happened *because* of a certain fact: the commentator explains that it happened *in spite of* that fact.

As regards the second difficulty Mr. Humphry and Prof. Lumby are totally silent. Yet the difficulty is obvious and considerable. Peter cannot have included the words of Ps. lxix. 2 in his quotation without a special purpose, for they come from a different Psalm to the second part of his quotation, and therefore must have a special bearing. When however verses 18 and 19 are removed from Peter's speech there is absolutely nothing left for these words to refer to: nothing in the nature of an ἔπαυλις is referred to as belonging to Judas, for the word describes "a place," "spot," something which has *locality*, something which can be "inhabited," and cannot therefore refer to the *office* of Judas. Bishop Wordsworth however apparently does so take it and writes, "ἔπαυλις, *a sheep-cote*. An allusion to the *pastoral* office of Judas." If this be so, the passage becomes no longer merely unintelligible but definitely self-contradictory: if the allusion in ἔπαυλις is to be explained as an allusion to the pastoral office of Judas, then the quotation of Peter becomes this, "Let his pastoral office become desolate, and let no man dwell therein, and his office let another take." It is needless to say more.

The passage is in itself absolutely clear. A necessary

event in the past has rendered necessary certain action in the present. The necessary event in the past was the betrayal of Jesus by an Apostle, and the subsequent miserable end of that Apostle: the necessary action in the present is the appointment of his successor. To prove this twofold necessity Peter quotes a "scripture" which is itself twofold, being made up of a portion of Psalm lxix. and of Psalm cix., and which, interpreted Messianically, first invokes the curse of desolation on a spot or place which once belonged to some enemy of Messiah, and secondly directs that the overseership which he held (his death being thus implied) shall be filled up. The whole passage coheres accurately; there is neither fault nor flaw in it. Peter first relates the facts as to the past: he then introduces the prophetic scripture which is found exactly to tally with them; he finally deduces from it a course of action in the present. His words may be thus paraphrased:

"It was necessary that the scripture should be fulfilled which was spoken concerning Judas the betrayer of Jesus—concerning Judas, I say, *because* he was one of us, one of the Twelve (and the passage refers definitely to one who held an overseership). He indeed then—he the traitor to such a trust and to such a Master—with the price of his guilt purchased a field, and there met with a death so strange and awful that the fact became notorious to all in Jerusalem, and the field in consequence received the name Aceldamach, 'The Field of Blood.' Thus has the scripture been accurately fulfilled: Jesus has been betrayed by an Apostle; the field which the traitor owned has been rendered desolate and uninhabitable; he who was an overseer has left his overseership vacant. The fulfilment of the scripture thus experienced in the past enforces on us the duty of following its guidance in the present. It is necessary therefore to appoint . . ."

Tabulated, the correspondence of events with prophecy is this:

Judas the traitor was an Apostle.	The enemy of Messiah held an "overseership."
Judas ἐκτήσατο χωρίον.	The enemy of Messiah possessed an ἔπαυλις.
The χωρίον has become Ἀκελδαμάχ, τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χωρίον Αἵματος.	The ἔπαυλις was to become desolate and no man to dwell therein.
Judas has left the place of an Apostle vacant.	The scripture speaks of an "overseership" to be filled up, and which must therefore have been left vacant.
The vacancy we must fill up.	The scripture so directs.

The words τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν present the only difficulty. Remove them and there is none, for the explanatory τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χωρίον Αἵματος is necessarily added to make the meaning clear to Gentile readers (cf. Mark vii. 11, Κορβάν, ὅ εστιν Δῶρον). It is usual to explain them as added by Luke, not unnaturally but certainly awkwardly, from his own point of view, as writing in Greek, and that of his readers, as only understanding Greek. This is however unsatisfactory, for the word Ἀκελδαμάχ is fully explained by τοῦτ' ἔστιν X. A., and these additional words are absolutely superfluous. Many MSS. read τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ, and this peculiar phrase only occurs in N.T. here and chap. ii. 6, 8, where it is used with a very clear and special meaning. I am strongly inclined therefore to think that the words have crept in here by error from the succeeding paragraph. This however is only conjecture; what is certain is, that it is unreasonable to make shipwreck of the sense of the whole passage because of this slight difficulty.

Lastly it may be noted that the identification of the scene of Judas' death with the field which he purchased is not merely sufficiently indicated in Luke, but was also an early tradition: De Wette refers to a "quotation from Papias in Apollinaris, which specifically says of Judas, ἐν ἰδίῳ φασὶ χωρίῳ τελευτήσαντα."

THOMAS ETHELBERT PAGE.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

II.

"I thank my God always, making mention of thee in my prayers, hearing of thy love, and of the faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all the saints; that the fellowship of thy faith may become effectual, in the knowledge of every good thing which is in you, unto Christ. For I had much joy and comfort in thy love, because the hearts of the saints have been refreshed through thee, brother."—PHILEM. 4–7 (Rev. Ver.).

PAUL'S was one of those regal natures to which things are possible that other men dare not do. No suspicion of weakness attaches to him when he pours out his heart in love, nor any of insincerity when he speaks of his continual prayers for his friends, or when he runs over in praise of his converts. Few men have been able to talk so much of their love without betraying its shallowness and self-consciousness, or of their prayers without exciting a doubt of their manly sincerity. But the Apostle could venture to do these things without being thought either feeble or false, and could unveil his deepest affections and his most secret devotions without provoking either a smile or a shrug.

He has the habit of beginning all his letters with thankful commendations and assurances of a place in his prayers. The exceptions are 2 Corinthians, where he writes under strong and painful emotion, and Galatians, where a vehement accusation of fickleness takes the place of the usual greeting. But these exceptions make the habit more conspicuous. But though this is a habit, it is not a form, but is the perfectly simple and natural expression of the moment's feelings. He begins his letters so, not in order to please and to say smooth things, but because he feels lovingly, and his heart fills with a pure joy which speaks most fitly in prayer. To recognise good is the way to make good better. Teachers must love if their teaching is to help. The best way to secure the doing of any signal act of Christian generosity, such as Paul wished of Phile-

mon is to show absolute confidence that it will be done, because it is in accordance with what we know of the doer's character. "It's a shame to tell Arnold a lie: he always trusts us," the Rugby boys used to say. Nothing could so powerfully have swayed Philemon to grant Paul's request, as Paul's graceful mention of his beneficence, which mention is yet by no means conscious diplomacy, but simple instinct.

The words of this section are simple enough, but their order is not altogether clear. They are a good example of the hurry and rush of the Apostle's style, arising from his impetuosity of nature. His thoughts and feelings come knocking at "the door of his lips" in a crowd, and do not always make their way out in logical order. For instance, he begins here with thankfulness, and that suggests the mention of his prayers, *v.* 4. Then he gives the occasion of his thankfulness in *v.* 5, "Hearing of thy love and of the faith which thou hast," etc. He next tells Philemon the subject matter of his prayers in *v.* 6, "That the fellowship of thy faith may become effectual," etc. These two verses thus correspond to the two clauses of *v.* 4, and finally in *v.* 7 he harks back once more to his reasons for thankfulness in Philemon's love and faith, adding, in a very lovely and pathetic way, that the good deeds done in far off Colossæ had wafted a refreshing air to the Roman prison house, and, little as the doer knew it, had been a joy and comfort to the solitary prisoner there.

I. We have then here the character of Philemon, which made Paul glad and thankful. The order of the language is noteworthy. Love is put before faith. The significance of this sequence comes out by contrast with similar expressions in Ephesians i. 15: "Your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints" (A.V.) and Colossians i. 4: "Your faith in Christ Jesus, and the love which ye have toward all the saints," where the same elements are

arranged in the more natural order, corresponding to their logical relation; *viz.* Faith first, and love as its consequence. The reason for the change here is probably that Onesimus and Epaphras, from whom Paul would be likely to hear of Philemon, would enlarge upon his practical benevolence, and would naturally say less about the root than about the sweet and visible fruit. The arrangement then is an echo of the talks which had gladdened the Apostle. Possibly, too, love is put first, because the object of the whole letter is to secure its exercise towards the fugitive slave; and seeing that the Apostle would listen with that purpose in view, each story which was told of Philemon's kindness to others made the deeper impression on Paul. The order here is the order of analysis, digging down from manifestation to cause: the order in the parallel passages quoted is the order of production, ascending from root to flower.

Another peculiarity in the arrangement of the words is that the objects of love and faith are named in the reverse order to that in which these graces are mentioned, "the Lord Jesus" being first, and "all the saints" last. Thus we have, as it were, "faith towards the Lord Jesus" imbedded in the centre of the verse, while "thy love . . . toward all the saints," which flows from it, wraps it round. The arrangement is like some forms of Hebrew poetical parallelism, in which the first and fourth members correspond, and the second and third, or like the pathetic measure of *In Memoriam*, and has the same sweet lingering cadence; while it also implies important truths as to the central place in regard to human virtues which knit hearts in soft bonds of love and help, of the faith which finds its sole object in Jesus Christ.

The source and foundation of goodness and nobility of character is faith in Jesus the Lord. That must be buried deep in the soul if tender love toward men is to flow from it. It is "the very pulse of the machine." All the pearls

of goodness are held in solution in faith. Or, to speak more accurately, faith in Christ gives possession of His life and Spirit, from which all good is unfolded; and it further sets in action strong motives by which to lead to every form of purity and beauty of soul; and, still further, it brings the heart into glad contact with a Divine love which forgives its Onesimuses, and so it cannot but touch the heart into some glad imitation of that love which is its own dearest treasure. So that, for all these and many more reasons, love to men is the truest visible expression, as it is the direct and necessary result, of faith in Christ. What is exhaled from the heart and drawn upwards by the fervours of Christ's self-sacrificing love is faith; when it falls on earth again, as a sweet rain of pity and tenderness, it is love.

Further, the true object of faith and one phase of its attitude towards that object are brought out in this central clause. We have the two names which express, the one the divinity, the other the humanity of Christ. So the proper object of faith is the whole Christ, in both His natures, the Divine-human Saviour. Christian faith sees the divinity in the humanity, and the humanity around the divinity. A faith which grasps only the manhood is maimed, and indeed has no right to the name. Humanity is not a fit object of trust. It may change; it has limits; it must die. "Cursed be the man that maketh flesh his arm," is as true about faith in a merely human Christ as about faith in any other man. There may be reverence, there may be in some sense love, obedience, imitation; but there should not be, and I see not how there can be, the absolute reliance, the utter dependence, the unconditional submission, which are of the very essence of faith, in the emotions which men cherish towards a human Christ. The Lord Jesus only can evoke these; on the other hand, the far off splendour and stupendous glory of the Divine

nature becomes the object of untrembling trust, and draws near enough to be known and loved, when we have it mellowed to our weak eyes by shining through the tempering medium of His humanity.

The preposition here used to define the relation of faith to its object is noteworthy. We find several different phases of that connexion expressed by different prepositions in the New Testament. Sometimes faith is spoken of as "in" Christ, sometimes as "unto Him" or "upon Him"; but here it is "toward" Him. The idea is that of aspiration and movement of yearning after an unattained good. And that is one part of the true office of faith. There is fruition and contact in it. We rest *in* Christ by faith. It incorporates us into His mystical body, and brings about a mutual indwelling. We lean *on* Christ by faith, and by it build the fabric of our loves, and repose the weight of our confidence upon Him, as on the sure foundation. We reach *unto* and, in deepest truth, pass *into* Christ by faith. But there is also in faith an element of aspiration, as of the soaring eagle to the sun, or the climbing tendrils to the summit of the supporting stem. In Christ there is always something beyond, which discloses itself the more clearly, the fuller is our present possession of Him. Faith builds upon and rests in the Christ possessed and experienced, and just therefore will it, if it be true, yearn towards the Christ unpossessed. A great reach of flashing glory beyond opens on us, as we round each new headland in that unending voyage. Our faith should and will be an ever-increasing fruition of Christ, accompanied with increasing perception of unreached depths in Him, and increasing longing after enlarged possession of His infinite fulness.

Where the centre is such a faith, its circumference and outward expression will be a widely diffused love. That deep and most private emotion of the soul, which is the flight of the lonely spirit to the single Christ, as if these

two were alone in the world, does not bar a man off from his kind, but effloresces into the largest and most practical love. One point of the compasses struck deeply and firmly into that centre of all things, the other can steadily sweep a wide circle. The widest is not here drawn, but a somewhat narrower, concentric one. The love is "toward all saints." Clearly their relation to Jesus Christ puts all Christians into relation with one another. That was an astounding thought in Philemon's days, when such high walls separated race from race, the slave from the free, woman from man; but the new faith leaped all barriers, and put a sense of brotherhood into every heart that learned God's fatherhood in Jesus. The nave of the wheel holds all the spokes in place. The sun makes the system called by its name a unity, though some planets be of giant bulk and swing through a mighty orbit, waited on by obedient satellites, and some be but specks and move through a narrow circle, and some have scarce been seen by human eye. All are one, though solemn abysses part them, and though no message has ever crossed the gulfs from one to another, because all revolve round one sun.

The recognition of the common relation which all who bear the same relation to Christ bear to one another has more formidable difficulties to encounter to-day than it had in these times when the Church had no stereotyped creeds and no stiffened organizations, and when to the flexibility of its youth was added the warmth of new conviction and the joy of a new field for expanding emotions of brotherly kindness. But nothing can absolve from the duty. Creeds separate, Christ unites. The road to "the reunion of Christendom" is through closer union to Jesus Christ. When that is secured, barriers which now keep brethren apart will be leaped, or pulled down, or got rid of somehow. It is of no use to say, "Go to, let us love one another." That will be unreal, mawkish, histrionic. "The faith

which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus" will be the productive cause, as it is the measure of "thy love toward all the saints."

But the love which is here commended is not a mere feeling, nor does it go off in gushes, however fervid, of eloquent emotion. Clearly Philemon was a benefactor of the brotherhood, and his love did not spend only the paper money of words and promises to pay, but the solid coin of kindly deeds. Practical charity is plainly included in that love of which it had cheered Paul in his imprisonment to hear. Its mention, then, is one step nearer to the object of the letter. Paul conducts his siege of Philemon's heart skilfully, and opens here a fresh parallel, and creeps a yard or two closer up. "Surely you are not going to shut out one of your own household from that wide-reaching kindness." So much is most delicately hinted, or rather, left to Philemon to infer, by this recognition of his brotherly love. A hint lies in it that there may be a danger of cherishing a cheap and easy charity that reverses the law of gravity, and *in*creases as the square of the distance, having tenderness and smiles for people and Churches which are well out of our road, and frowns for some nearer home. "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how shall he love" his brother "whom he hath not seen?"

II. In *v.* 6 we have the apostolic prayer for Philemon, grounded on the tidings of his love and faith. It is immediately connected with "the prayers" of *v.* 4 by the introductory "that," which is best understood as introducing the subject matter of the prayer. Whatever then may be the meaning of this supplication, it is a prayer for Philemon, and not for others. That remark disposes of the explanations which widen its scope, contrary, as it seems to me, to the natural understanding of the context.

"The fellowship of thy faith" is capable of more than one meaning. The signification of the principal word and

the relation expressed by the preposition may be variously determined. "Fellowship" is more than once used in the sense of sharing material wealth with Christ's poor, or more harshly and plainly, charitable contribution. So we find it in Romans xv. 26 and 2 Corinthians ix. 13. Adopting that meaning here, the preposition must express, as it often does, the origin of Philemon's kindly gifts, namely, his faith; and the whole phrase accords with the preceding verse in its view of the genesis of beneficence to the brethren as the result of faith in the Lord.

The Apostle prays that this faith-begotten practical liberality may become efficacious, or may acquire still more power; *i.e.* may increase in activity, and so may lead to "the knowledge of every good thing that is in us." The interpretation has found extensive support, which takes this as equivalent to a desire that Philemon's good deeds might lead others, whether enemies or friends, to recognise the beauties of sympathetic goodness in the true Christian character. Such an explanation hopelessly confuses the whole, and does violence to the plain requirements of the context, which limit the prayer to Philemon. It is *his* "knowledge" of which Paul is thinking. The same profound and pregnant word is used here which occurs so frequently in the other epistles of the captivity, and which always means that deep and vital knowledge which knows because it possesses. Usually its object is God as revealed in the great work and person of Christ. Here its object is the sum total of spiritual blessings, the whole fulness of the gifts given us by, and, at bottom, consisting of, that same Christ dwelling in the heart, who is revealer, because He is communicator, of God. The full, deep knowledge of this manifold and yet one good is no mere theoretical work of the understanding, but is that experience which is only possible to him who enjoys it.

The meaning of the whole prayer, then, put into feebler

and more modern dress is simply that Philemon's liberality and Christian love may grow more and more, and may help him to a fuller appropriation and experience of the large treasures "which are in us," though in germ and potentiality only, until brought into consciousness by our own Christian growth. The various reading "in us," or "in you" only widens the circle of possessors of these gifts to the whole Church, or narrows it to the believers of Colossæ.

There still remain for consideration the last words of the clause, "unto Christ." They must be referred back to the main subject of the sentence, "may become effectual." They seem to express the condition on which Christian "fellowship," like all Christian acts, can be quickened with energy, and tend to spiritual progress; namely, that it shall be done as to the Lord. There is perhaps in this appended clause a kind of lingering echo of our Lord's own words, in which He accepts as done unto Him the kindly deeds done to the least of His brethren.

So then this great prayer brings out very strongly the goal to which the highest perfection of Christian character has still to aspire. Philemon was no weakling or laggard in the Christian conflict and race. His attainments sent a thrill of thankfulness through the Apostle's spirit. But there remained "very much land to be possessed"; and precisely because he had climbed so far, does his friend pray that he may mount still higher, where the sweep of view is wider, and the air clearer still. It is an endless task to bring into conscious possession and exercise all the fulness with which Christ endows His feeblest servant. Not till all that God can give, or rather has given, has been incorporated in the nature and wrought out in the life, is the term reached. This is the true sublime of the Christian life, that it begins with the reception of a strictly infinite gift, and demands immortality as the field in order to unfold its worth. Continual progress in all that ennobles the nature,

satisfies the heart, and floods the mind with light is the destiny of the Christian soul, and of it alone. Therefore unwearied effort, buoyancy, and hope which no dark memories can dash nor any fears darken should mark their temper, to whom the future offers an absolutely endless and limitless increase in the possession of the infinite God.

There is also brought out in this prayer the value of Christian beneficence as a means of spiritual growth. Philemon's "communication of faith" will help him to the knowledge of the fulness of Christ. The reaction of conduct on character and growth in godliness is a familiar idea with Paul, especially in the prison epistles. Thus we read in his prayer for the Colossians, "fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God." The faithful carrying out in life of what we already know is not the least important condition of increasing knowledge. If a man does not live up to his religion, his religion shrinks to the level of his life. Unoccupied territory lapses. We hold our spiritual gifts on the term of using them. The practice of convictions deepens convictions; not that the exercise of Christian graces will make theologians, but it will put in larger possession of the knowledge which is life.

While this general principle is abundantly enforced in Scripture and confirmed by experience, the specific form of it here is that the right administration of wealth is a direct means of increasing a Christian's possession of the large store treasured in Christ. Every loving thought towards the sorrowful and the needy, every touch of sympathy yielded to, and every kindly, Christlike deed flowing from these, thins away some film of the barriers between the believing soul and a full possession of God, makes it more capable of beholding Him and of rising to communion with Him. The possibilities of wealth lie, not only in the direction of earthly advantages, but in the fact that men may so use it as to secure their being "received into ever-

lasting habitations." Modern evangelical teachers have been afraid to say what Paul ventured to say on this matter, for fear of obscuring the truth which Paul gave his life to preach. Surely they need not be more jealous for the doctrine of "justification by faith" than he was; and if he had no scruples in telling rich men to "lay up in store for themselves a good foundation for the time to come," by being "ready to communicate," they may safely follow. There is probably no more powerful cause of the comparative feebleness of average English Christianity than the selfish use of money, and no surer means of securing a great increase in the depth and richness of the individual Christian life than the fuller application of Christian principle, that is, of the law of sacrifice, to the administration of property.

The final clause of the verse seems to state the condition on which Philemon's good deeds will avail for his own growth in grace, and implies that in him that condition is fulfilled. If a man does deeds of kindness and help to one of these little ones, as "unto Christ," then his beneficence will come back in spiritual blessing on his own head. If they are the result of simple natural compassion, beautiful as it is, they will reinforce *it*, but have no tendency to strengthen that from which they do *not* flow. If they are tainted by any self-regard, then they are not charitable deeds at all. What is done for Christ will bring to the doer more of Christ as its consequence and reward. All life, with all its varied forms of endurance and service, comes under this same law, and tends to make more assured and more blessed and more profound the knowledge and grasp of the fulness of Christ, in the measure in which it is directed to Him, and done or suffered for His sake.

III. The present section closes with a very sweet and pathetic representation of the Apostle's joy in the character of his friend.

The "for" of *v.* 7 connects not with the words of petition immediately before, but with "I thank my God" (*v.* 4), and gives a graceful turn—graceful only because so unforced and true—to the sentence. "My thanks are due to you for your kindness to others, for, though you did not think of it, you have done me as much good as you did them." The "love" which gives Paul such "great joy and consolation" is not love directed to himself, but to others; and the reason why it gladdened the Apostle was because it had "refreshed the hearts" of sorrowful and needy saints in Colossæ. This tender expression of affectionate joy in Philemon's good deeds is made wonderfully emotional by that emphatic "brother" which ends the verse, and by its unusual position in the sentence assumes the character of a sudden, irrepressible shoot of love from Paul's heart towards Philemon, like the quick impulse with which a mother will catch up her child, and cover it with caresses. Paul was never ashamed of showing his tenderness, and it never repels us.

These final words suggest the unexpected good which good deeds may do. No man can ever tell how far the blessing of his small acts of kindness, or other pieces of Christian conduct, may travel. They may benefit one in material fashion, but the fragrance may reach far beyond. Philemon little dreamed that his small charity to some suffering brother in Colossæ would find its way across the sea, and bring a waft of coolness and refreshing into the hot prison house. Neither Paul nor Philemon dreamed that, made immortal by the word of the former, the same transient act would find its way across the centuries, and would "smell sweet and blossom in the dust" to-day. Men know not who are their audiences, or who may be spectators of their works; for they are all bound so mystically and closely together, that none can tell how far the vibrations which he sets in motion will thrill. This is true

about all deeds, good and bad, and invests them all with solemn importance. The arrow shot travels beyond the archer's eye, and may wound where he knows not. The only thing certain about the deed once done is, that its irrevocable consequences will reach much farther than the doer thought of, and that no limits can be set to the subtle influence which, for blessing or harm, it exerts.

Since the diameter of the circle which our acts may fill is unknown and unknowable, the doer who stands at the centre is all the more solemnly bound to make sure of what he can make sure of, the quality of the influence sent forth; and since his deed may blight or bless so widely, to clarify his motives and guard his doings, that they may bring only good wherever they light.

May we not venture to see shining through the Apostle's words the Master's face? "Even as Christ did for us with God the Father," says Luther, "thus also doth St. Paul for Onesimus with Philemon"; and that thought may permissibly be applied to many parts of this letter, to which it gives much beauty. It may not be all fanciful to say that, as Paul's heart was gladdened when he heard of the good deeds done in far off Colossæ by a man who "owed to him his own self," so we may believe that Christ is glad and has "great joy in our love" to His servants and in our kindliness, when He beholds the poor work done by the humblest for His sake. He sees and rejoices, and approves when there are none but Himself to know or praise; and at last many who did lowly service to His friends will be surprised to hear from His lips the acknowledgment that it was Himself whom they had visited and succoured, and that they had been ministering to the Master's joy when they had only known themselves to be succouring His servants' need.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GENTILE CHURCHES.

Just as there are double stars, consisting of two suns revolving round and enlightening each the other; just as in the teaching of Jesus there are pairs of parables, in which the same truth is represented under two aspects, the one supplementing the other—for example, the parables of the leaven and the grain of mustard seed, of the treasure hid in a field and the pearl of great price, of the lost sheep and the lost piece of silver; so in the apostolic correspondence there are pairs of epistles, so to speak, in which two aspects of the same subject are treated separately, in such a way as to set the whole question in a clear light.

Such is the relation between the Epistle to the Romans and that to the Galatians, as also between the two minor epistles of John; and still more strikingly between the Epistle to the Colossians and that to the Ephesians.

I.

We have seen that when false doctrine was threatening to invade the Church of Colosse in Phrygia, the Apostle set forth Jesus Christ the Son of God as Himself the Head of the Church, which is His body upon earth. In this way he sought to bring home to the Colossians the futility of the mediation of angels, and the uselessness of those Jewish ordinances under which some were trying to bring them into bondage. On this occasion the Apostle felt himself called to address another letter to several Gentile Churches in Asia Minor, of which the Church of Colosse was one. Paul had not himself founded these Churches, and had never visited them. For this very reason he felt all the more bound, as the Apostle of the Gentiles, to do something for these young Christian societies, which, planted in the midst of paganism, belonged to his apostolic domain.

This more general epistle was intended at the same time

to supplement that to the Colossians. In the earlier letter Christ was set forth as the Divine Head of the Church; in this, he desired to show to these Gentile converts, that this new society into which they had been incorporated was as the earthly body of the heavenly Head. This was only repeating to the Church, under another form, the sublime truth which Jesus had taught His disciples under the figure of the vine and its branches. This letter is, if we mistake not, that which appears in our canon as the Epistle to the Ephesians.

It may seem strange that we should so describe a letter which we have already said was addressed to Churches, which, like the Church of Colosse, were situated in the interior of Asia Minor, many days' distance from the great metropolis of Ionia. Our reasons are as follows:

One cannot but be struck, in reading the letter commonly called the Epistle to the Ephesians, with the fact that in several passages the Apostle speaks to his readers as to Christians personally unknown to him. Thus in chap. i. 15, he says to them that he has "heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among them, and which they show toward all the saints." And in chap. iii. 2, he expresses himself thus: "If so be ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which was given me to youward" (that is, his apostleship to the Gentiles). In chap. iv. 21, he writes: "But ye did not so learn Christ; if so be that ye heard Him, and were taught in Him, even as truth is in Jesus." Now Paul never could have written thus if he had been addressing the Church at Ephesus.

Another feature of this epistle seems to make it highly improbable that it was intended for that Church; namely, the absence of any personal greetings at its close. Can we suppose that Paul would not have mentioned the names of at least some of the members of this Church, with which he abode so long, if this letter was really intended for it? To

these two considerations there is a third to be added, which, from very early times, has struck attentive readers of this epistle. In many ancient manuscripts the words "at Ephesus," in *v.* 1, are omitted after "the saints which are." This gave rise to a very extraordinary explanation. "*The saints which are*," was made to signify the saints who possess the true, celestial, eternal existence. But the words thus understood would be a philosophical expression such as we do not find anywhere else in Scripture. Unless we are prepared to admit that the words "at Ephesus" have been expunged for some unexplained reason, we must conclude from this omission that the name of those to whom it was sent, was not mentioned in the original letter, and that the heading, "Epistle to the Ephesians" was added when the collection of St. Paul's epistles was made in the Churches, and that it was based on a mistaken supposition. This we shall now proceed to show.

To whom did the Apostle really address this letter? and how can we account for the fact that their name was omitted in the superscription?

The first question is easily answered. There is so close and continuous a connexion between this epistle and that to the Colossians, that they must have been written almost at the same time and addressed to readers who had much in common. This conclusion is confirmed by the singular expression, chap. vi. 21: "But that ye also may know my affairs, how I do, Tychicus, the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you all things." This expression, "that ye also," seems to prove, in the first place, that Paul was not addressing this letter to a single Church, but to several, each of which was included in the "ye also"; and the idea is that they should all one after the other, receive from Tychicus tidings of the Apostle. Colosse would certainly belong to the group of Churches which Paul had in view; for he uses a similar expression

in Colossians iv. 7: "All my affairs shall Tychicus make known unto you, the beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow servant in the Lord." Tychicus then was to visit in succession all the Churches to whom this epistle was addressed, and to leave a copy of it with them, while giving them at the same time *vivâ voce* tidings of the Apostle. We should naturally look for this group of churches, of which Colosse was one, in the province of Phrygia. Were such Churches actually found there? Assuredly. In the Epistle to the Colossians (ii. 1), Paul says: "For I would have you know how greatly I strive for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh." The Church of Laodicea, and others, like that of Hierapolis (Col. iv. 13), which had been founded without the co-operation of Paul, in this central district of Asia Minor, were the objects of his peculiar concern. Is it surprising, that while addressing to the Colossians a letter adapted to their particular circumstances, he should have felt anxious to send a second letter to these other Churches to supply the lack of a personal visit?

This supposition is further corroborated by the following fact. In the year 140, a young man of distinction, Marcion, the son of a bishop of Pontus, in Asia Minor, made a collection of the epistles of St. Paul, for the use of the Churches which he founded on a basis opposed to the prevailing orthodoxy. We have a list of the apostolic epistles which he admitted into his canon. Among them was what we call the Epistle to the Ephesians, but it appears as the Epistle to the Laodiceans. It is not impossible indeed that Marcion may have taken this name from the passage in the Colossians (iv. 16), in which the Apostle charges that Church to read the epistle to the Church at Laodicea. But why should he take this to mean the Epistle to the Ephesians? Marcion must have had some more definite

reason for thus describing it. May we not suppose that, in going from Pontus into the west, and visiting on his journey the Churches of Phrygia, he had found this epistle in the Church of Laodicea, as a letter addressed to that Church? If so, it is decisive that this epistle was intended for one, or more than one, of the Churches of Phrygia.

After this, it is easy to explain the omission of any name in the superscription of the letter. All that we have been saying suggests the following reply to the question: When Tychicus left Rome for Asia Minor, he had with him three letters, one to the Colossians, one to Philemon, and this which we call the Epistle to the Ephesians. This, as we have just shown, was to be delivered to the Churches of Phrygia around Colosse, all of which Tychicus was to visit. Now Tychicus possessed probably only one copy of this letter. The Apostle intended that he should have as many copies made at Ephesus as he would require, in order that each Church might have one addressed to itself. The original letter remains in the archives of the Church of Ephesus, just as Tychicus brought it, with no indication to whom it was addressed. In the copies the blank was filled in according to the destination of each letter. Marcion found at Laodicea that which bore the name of that Church, and he therefore, in all good faith, so catalogued it in his canon. But when subsequently the various Churches of Christendom were desirous to possess it, they naturally sent to Ephesus, the great seaport and chief city of that region, for copies. Thus the epistle came to be spoken of throughout Christendom as the Epistle to the Ephesians; and the words "at Ephesus" were added to the superscription, though traces of the original blank left to be filled in, still remained. In fact, the words are omitted in the two most ancient MSS. of the New Testament now in our possession—the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus.

At the close of the Epistle to the Colossians, Paul enjoins that Church to read the epistle which was to be sent to it from Laodicea, and to send on to that Church its own epistle. From all that goes before, it appears evident that this letter which was to be sent to the Colossians from Laodicea, was no other than our Epistle to the Ephesians, which was the fitting supplement to that which the Colossians themselves had received and which they were to forward to Laodicea.

II.

Let us now proceed to study the scope of this epistle. Chrysostom said, "That which the Apostle had nowhere else proclaimed, he reveals in this scripture." This is true. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul refers to a higher spiritual wisdom contained in the gospel; but he adds that he can only speak of it among the perfect. Those whom he thus describes were those who had come to the stature of full grown men in Christ, as he says again in Ephesians iv. 13. This wisdom was nothing else than the apprehension of the Divine plan, and it is this which he sets forth in the epistle before us.

We have seen that the epistles of St. Paul generally begin with thanksgiving, the subject of which is the work of God already accomplished in those to whom he writes, and that this thanksgiving is followed by a prayer in which the Apostle asks that the gracious work may go on in their souls. After this, he passes to the subject he proposes to treat. In the epistle before us he commences with thanksgiving and prayer; but, if I may so speak, he never gets beyond this, and all that he has to impart to his readers is included in the outpouring of gratitude and desire, which runs through the whole of the first three chapters. All that follows from the beginning of chap. iv. is only the

practical application of this true apprehension of the Divine work.

The thanksgiving turns on the treasury of heavenly benedictions which God has opened to these Christians. The Apostle traces this river of grace back to its source in the eternal decree by which God has predestinated believers to salvation and to adoption in the person of His well-beloved Son (i. 3–6). Then he reminds them of the cost at which this merciful design has been fulfilled, "redemption through the blood of Christ" (*v.* 7); and through the revelation granted to the Church gives them a glimpse of the glorious consummation of the Divine plan—the gathering together of all things, both in earth and heaven, under the sovereignty of Christ, the supreme Head of the universe (*vv.* 8–10). After having thus glanced at the source, the means, and the end, he goes on to show that this great plan is already in process of fulfilment by the calling of God unto salvation, addressed first to the Jews, then to those Gentiles, who have believed and been sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise (*vv.* 11–14). This is the beginning of the gathering together of all things in Christ. After thus descending from the heights of the Divine intention to its application to his readers, the Apostle proceeds to offer prayer on their behalf. For after their conversion there is much progress to be made. Have they themselves grasped the extent of the change which has been wrought and yet is to be wrought in them? Have they sufficiently understood the grandeur of the position to which their new faith entitles them? Have they considered the exceptional greatness of the power which has been at work within them to effect this change? It is upon this point the Apostle asks that they may be enlightened (*vv.* 15–19). It is essential for them to understand that that which has been done and yet is to be done in them, is nothing less than a transformation similar to that wrought by God in the person of

Christ Himself, when "He raised Him from the dead, and made Him to sit at His own right hand in the heavenly places." From this glorious, high throne, Christ is forming for Himself a body here on earth, even the Church, filled with the fulness of His life (*vv.* 19–23). It is a similar work which God accomplishes in believers, when, finding them "dead in trespasses and sins," He "quickens them together with (or in) Christ, and raises them up with Him" in such sort that they live in Him in the heavenly places. This is a fact already accomplished by grace on God's part, by faith on theirs. They are really saved; and that without any meritorious effort of their own, but by the pure mercy of God, who places them henceforward in a new relation to Himself, in which they may abound with good works (ii. 1–10).

The Apostle now comes to the principal point on which he wishes specially to insist with those to whom he was writing. Who were you, he says, you whom God has thus dealt with; whom He has raised like Christ Himself, from death to life, from the grave to the throne? Were you aforetime among His covenanted people? Had you any part in the promises? Nay, ye were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope." Nevertheless God has brought even these Gentiles nigh to Himself by the blood of the cross, and has made them His people. He has broken down for them the wall of separation, the law, which rose between them and the Jews, and has thus brought together in one body these two races—till now so bitterly hostile—the Jews and the Gentiles. In thus reconciling both unto Himself and abolishing the enmity, He "has made in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace." He gives to both access to the throne of grace on equal terms (*vv.* 11–18). So far then from being any more strangers, they are "fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God,"

and are built up like living stones into the spiritual temple, founded upon Christ and His Apostles, and a habitation of God through the Spirit (*vv.* 19–22).

Such is the greatness of the grace of which they are the subjects. St. Paul adds yet one more point which concerns him personally. In order to effect this incorporation of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God, there must be the creation of a new apostolate in addition to that of the twelve. This apostolate extraordinary is that with which Paul, the writer of this epistle, and now a prisoner, has been invested. Unto him, who accounted himself "less than the least of all saints, was this grace given," that he "should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ"; and that he should make all men see that the Gentiles were fellow heirs, fellow members of the body, and partakers of the "promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel" (ii. 1–12).

He entreats them therefore not to be troubled by the tribulations he has to endure for so great a cause, which are a glory and not a shame to them. And here he again falls into prayer, and from his prison intercedes with God on their behalf. He gives them, so to speak, a glimpse into his prison cell, where on his knees and pleading for these Churches of Asia Minor which he has never seen, he asks for them that they may be strengthened with power through the Holy Ghost, that Christ may dwell in their hearts through faith, that they may be rooted and grounded in love, that they may have the inward illumination by which the gracious work of God will be revealed to them in all its height and length and breadth and depth, that thus they may be filled with the very fulness of God. What can he ask more? (*vv.* 13–21.)

So far extends the utterance of praise and prayer, which, in the other epistles, precedes the introduction of the main theme of the letter, but which in this instance includes it.

The whole of the first part of the epistle forms one hymn, in the midst of which the subject is intercalated. In the second part (iv.–vi.), Paul only draws the practical conclusions from the promises of grace which he has been magnifying. He makes the greatness of their Divine calling a plea for the holiness of life by which these Gentile Christians should walk worthy of it (iv. 1).

And first: as a Church, they are bound to maintain unity in the faith, each one consecrating to the good of the whole, the gifts he has received from the glorified Christ. It is for the growth and prosperity of His body, the Church, that the invisible Head has bestowed particularly the four essential gifts by which the body is to be raised to the perfect stature of its Head. He has thus given, first, apostles and prophets, whose work it is to lay the foundations of the Church; evangelists, by whose ministry it is to be extended; lastly, pastors and teachers, whose office it is to build up that which has been already begun. These heavenly gifts are the means by which the glorified Lord guards His body, the Church, from the seductive influence of false doctrines, and makes it grow up into the fulness of spiritual life (iv. 2–16).

From the life of the Church the Apostle passes to that of individuals. After reminding his readers of what they once were, he sums up all that he has to ask of them under two heads: he charges them to put off the old man, and to put on the new man created in the image of God (*vv.* 17–24). In order to give vividness to this idea, he proceeds to contrast each member of the new man with its corresponding member in the old. This brings out the eight following antitheses:

Falsehood—truth (*v.* 25).

Anger—forgiveness (*vv.* 26, 27).

Theft—doing good (*v.* 28).

Corrupt speech—words of edification (*vv.* 29, 30).

Bitterness—love (*v.* 31; v. 2).
Impurity—chasteness (*vv.* 3–14).
Unwisdom—wisdom (*vv.* 15–17).
Rioting and excess—spiritual joy (*vv.* 18–20).

We have observed these same contrasts in the Epistle to the Colossians (iii. 15–17); but there all the members of the old man were united as in one body, and contrasted with the new man as a whole.

Lastly, from the life of the individual the Apostle passes to the life of the family, which is to bear in all its relations the impress of Christian holiness. The parallel passage (Col. iii. 18; iv. 11) goes much less into detail.

The salient feature in this picture of a Christian family is mutual and voluntary subordination (v. 31). The Apostle refers first to the relation of husband and wife, which is compared to that between Christ and the Church (v. 22–23). This is the centre of the family life, and around it is formed first the inner circle of parents and children (vi. 1–4), and outside this the relation of masters and slaves (*vv.* 5–9).

But this ideal of Christian holiness in the life of the Church, of the individual, and the family cannot be realised without conflict; and this conflict is not simply that which arises from indwelling and encompassing sin. The Christian has also to fight against invisible foes, devilish suggestions, which cannot be withstood by his own unaided strength. Hence the Apostle invites his readers to put on the various pieces of armour which God has provided for their use. Three of these he describes under the figure of armour to be bound to the body: the girdle, the inward possession of the truth; the breastplate, the stedfast love of righteousness; the shoes, the determination to meet the enemy only with the gospel of peace. He next describes three dispositions under the figure of the movable parts of the armour: faith in the Divine pro-

mises, the shield; the glorious hope of salvation, the helmet; the use of Scripture to repel the assaults of the enemy, the sword. Lastly, he urges them to use that which alone can make any of these weapons effectual—prayer. This he asks on behalf of all the saints, and specially for himself, their Apostle, "an ambassador now in chains" (*vv.* 10–20).

Thus will the Church fulfil its task in the world, which is to overthrow the kingdom of Satan, and to set up on its ruins the kingdom of God.

The Apostle concludes, as usual, with some personal details. He tells his readers that Tychicus is coming, who will bring them tidings, and comfort their hearts. His wish is that peace and love may be established among them on the foundation of the faith. He desires that grace may be with all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ in uncorruptness (*vv.* 20–24).

The unity of this Epistle is self-evident. Its one theme throughout is the calling to salvation by grace, addressed as freely to the Gentiles as to the Jews. This theme is explained in the first part of the Epistle (i.–iii.), and enforced in the second (iv.–vi.). It is impossible therefore to regard this Scripture as merely a collation of earlier writings; the piece of the new garment would show some disparity with the old. But there is no such disparity. This observation suffices to set aside the opinion, learnedly maintained by Holzmann, that the Epistle to the Ephesians is only the expansion of a short letter addressed by Paul to the Colossians. He argues that some writer of a later date possessed himself of the shorter epistle about the close of the first century, and manipulated it into what we call the Epistle to the Ephesians. A work thus composed of two heterogeneous elements could not fail to betray its origin by the want of that very directness,

logical sequence, and unity which are so marked in this Epistle.

Critics of the same school point to the many parallel passages in the Epistle to the Ephesians and that to the Colossians, and ask how these can be explained, except on the hypothesis we have mentioned, supplemented by the following. The supposed writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians, after having amplified Paul's original letter to the Colossians into what we call the Epistle to the Ephesians, afterwards manipulated also the original letter, using his own Epistle to the Ephesians in the process. In this way the mystery of the resemblance between the two canonical Epistles is explained.

It seems to us that the problem can be solved in a much simpler way. It is not impossible that two completely independent and original writings may coincide on certain points, both in substance and in form of expression. If they treat of two very similar subjects, if they are both by the same author, if both were written at about the same time of his life, and under the influence of the same feelings, it cannot be wondered at if there are strong resemblances, both of form and substance, between them. All these conditions are fulfilled in the two letters to which we are referring. It is not difficult for us to picture to ourselves what was taking place at the very time when they were written.

Epaphras has just come from Colosse to Rome. There he finds Paul and Timothy. He tells them of the new doctrine—a fusion of Essenism and Christianity—which is threatening his Church. Paul meditates a while. Then he says to Epaphras: "The best way to cut the roots of this false speculation with its ascetic tendencies, is to remind the Church of Colosse of the supreme dignity of Christ as the Head of the Church, in the presence of which all the glory of the angels vanishes away. Then to show

them that the work of Christ for the salvation of men is complete, that nothing is to be added to it; that baptism into His death is the true circumcision, that the law is henceforth like a cancelled charge, that the cross is the triumphant chariot to which the powers of darkness are bound and led captive. All the legal ordinances and practices enjoined by these false teachers will then be seen to be vain. The Colossians will understand that the true death and the true resurrection are to be found, not in their useless ascetic practices, but in sharing the death and resurrection of Jesus; and that all that remains is to consummate these two spiritual facts by the daily mortification of the old man, and the constant growth of the new."

Epaphras gives his joyful assent to this plan of campaign. Then Paul asks what tidings there are from the other Churches in the district. Epaphras tells him that they are walking in faith and in love (Eph. i. 15). Though they are not exposed to the same dangers as the Church at Colosse, it would be good for them nevertheless to be brought into direct personal relation with the Apostle, and to receive from him some words of encouragement. It would be especially useful to urge upon them the holiness which ought to characterise all the family relations, upon which the heretics were trying to bring discredit by a semblance of higher spirituality in their mode of living.

Paul at once sets himself to his task, with the help of Timothy (Col. i. 1). He first dictates to him the letter which has the most direct aim—the letter to the Colossians. Then, as Apostle to the Gentiles, Paul writes, in his own name only, the more general letter, with no polemical bearing, to the neighbouring Churches, to stir them up to adore the boundless grace bestowed upon them, and to urge them to a life becoming those so highly favoured.

Hence it comes to pass that the central idea of the Epistle to the Colossians is this: Christ the Head, from whom the

body derives all its nourishment; while the central idea of what we call the Epistle to the Ephesians is the Church, the body which Christ fills with His Divine fulness, and raises to sit with Him in the heavenly places. Of these two thoughts, which supplement each other, the second was certainly suggested by the first. The first note struck woke the vibrations of the next; then followed a pæan of Divine harmonies. What could be more natural than that two strains thus suggested, should have many tones in common, though each set in a different key?

But it has been said again: The style of the Epistle to the Ephesians is wholly unlike that of the Epistle to the Colossians, or of Paul's other letters. Instead of the close, argumentative strain to which we are accustomed, we find here the full, swelling notes of a hymn. This rich and abundant phraseology has nothing in common with the broken, concise, uniformly sober style of the Apostle.

Yet there are passages in other epistles, such as the close of the 8th and 11th chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, which show that Paul knew, not only how to teach and to discuss, but how to sing. He says himself to the Corinthians that he thanks God he can speak with tongues more than they all. Now the speaking with tongues was rather song than speech; it was the language of ecstasy. Can we be surprised if, in addressing Churches to whom he had no special teaching to impart or rebuke to administer, Paul should have for once risen to the exalted tones of a hymn, to magnify the grace which had wrought such great things for them?

The Epistle to the Ephesians is indeed a *tongue*, a tongue interpreted by Paul himself, and changed by this interpretation into a prophecy intelligible to all (1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19). The more I read and re-read this admirable letter, the more it strikes me that Paul himself tried to sum it all up in the words of his prayer (iii. 18), in which he asks God to

give his readers to understand the dimensions of the Divine salvation, of that edifice of which God is Himself the builder, "that ye may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height." The *length:* he describes it in chap. i., where he shows how the salvation of the world proceeds from an eternal decree, which was before all the ages, and the purport of which is to give the sovereignty to Christ in the dispensation of the fulness of the times. *The breadth:* he shows how the kingdom of God is gradually to embrace all intelligent beings: first, Jews and Gentiles—that is, all believers; finally men and angels, the sovereignty of Christ being thus co-extensive with the intelligent universe. *The depth:* he points to Christ going down into the dark abyss of death, to be set again on the highest throne by His resurrection and ascension. *The height:* he bids his readers look upon themselves as henceforth risen in Him, and seated with Him in the heavenly places.

Even Paul never wrote in grander strains than these, and to imagine that after his death another might have penned them in his name is to suppose that somewhere and somewhen there arose a second Paul, unknown to the Church, and who has left no other trace of his existence but this single letter. It is far easier to believe that once in his life the Apostle of the Gentiles beheld in raptured contemplation, and magnified in this sublime language, the glorious work committed to him—the work of restoring the unity of the body of mankind, which from the time of Abraham had been divided into two great branches, thus heralding and preluding the time when all things in heaven and earth should be gathered together in Christ.

This is the keynote of the Epistle to the Ephesians, as of the Gospel of John. The two great Apostles thus meet on the topmost height of the Christian revelation.

F. GODET.

RECENT AMERICAN LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The last summary of the American literature on the New Testament closed with March, 1885. Since that time a considerable body of literature has appeared, and the present summary aims at little more than furnishing an index to it. It is fair to warn the reader that the space at disposal has not been distributed among the works noticed in any nice adjustment to their comparative values; it has rather been our plan to say little even of the most important books where little seemed needed to bring out their essential character, and to say much where explanation seemed necessary or desirable.

The most notable book of the year is undoubtedly Prof. J. H. Thayer's Lexicon of New Testament Greek.[1] It is primarily a translation of Grimm's Clavis, which has been long recognised as not only the best lexicon to the New Testament, but no less than indispensable to every careful student. But Prof. Thayer's work has been far more than merely to translate Grimm's precise Latin into equally satisfactory English—though this in itself would have been a useful work. In translating he has revised, and in revising he has enlarged, until (although all of Prof. Grimm's work is scrupulously retained) the book is practically a new work, which "antiquates and abrogates" all other New Testament hand-lexicons—even Grimm itself and Robinson, the latter of which, for English-speaking students, has held the ground heretofore. The labour which Prof. Thayer has expended on his work is enormous, and has been directed not only towards perfecting the book as a handbook for scholars and making it a treasury of references to discussions of difficult points, but also towards fitting it for the use of beginners and making it the indispensable companion of the average student. The completed result worthily caps the long historical development of New Testament lexicography, which may be said to have begun with Schleusner (1792–1819) and to have flowed down to our time in an ever-growing and ever-clearing stream, through Wahl (1819–1843), Bretschneider (1824–1840), Wilke (1844–1851), and Grimm

[1] *A Greek-English Lexicon to the N. T., being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti, translated, revised and enlarged.* By Joseph Henry Thayer, Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in Harvard University. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1886. 4to.)

(1862–1879), with a worthy offshoot in Robinson (1825, 1836–1850). We wonder if the rising generation appreciates its advantage over those of old time in its possession of such helps in the most fundamental of disciplines as Thayer's Grimm and Cremer?

In the department of Textual Criticism we may pass over with this mere hint new and improved issues of their editions of Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament by the Messrs. Harper, in order to pause first on two interesting papers by English writers which have appeared in an American journal. These are a collation for St. Luke of the remarkable British Museum MS. Evan. 604, by Mr. W. H. Simcox,[1] and a paper on "Conflate Readings of the New Testament" by Mr. J. Rendel Harris,[2] at the time a Professor in Johns-Hopkins University at Baltimore. In the former the peculiar and valuable character of the codex in question is well illustrated; in the latter the learned author applies his attempt to reconstruct the original form of the New Testament autographs to some problems of transcriptional evidence, showing how, if that reconstruction be accepted, some difficult readings may be accounted for as errors of the eye taking up words laterally from one column into another and vertically from one line into another. It was well known at the time of his death that the late Prof. Ezra Abbot was contemplating an elaborate review of Dr. Scrivener's *Plain Introduction;* and now the notes of the errors in Scrivener which he had gathered for this purpose have been, so far as possible, put together and published in a valuable pamphlet[3] by Prof. Thayer, who has been able to add to this matter certain other notes collected by Prof. Harris and Dr. Gregory. The whole forms an imposing array of fifty-two closely-printed pages of fine type, which no user of Dr. Scrivener's comprehensive book can afford to be without. A very interesting Syriac MS., which contains all seven of the Catholic Epistles, having fallen into the way of Dr. Isaac H. Hall, he published an account of it in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* for 1884,[4] with additional and

[1] *The American Journal of Philology*, V. 4 (Dec., 1884), pp. 454–465.

[2] *The American Journal of Philology*, VI. 1 (April, 1885), pp. 25–40.

[3] *Notes on Scrivener's "Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T." third edition; chiefly from the memoranda of the late Prof. Ezra Abbot, D.D., LL.D., etc.* Edited by Joseph Henry Thayer, D.D. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; London: Ward, Lock & Co. 1885. 8vo. pp. 56.)

[4] Boston: 1885. Pp. 37–49.

corrective notes, printed in the same Journal for 1885,[1] and has since edited for the Publication Agency of the Johns-Hopkins University a beautiful series of phototypes of it.[2] The plates are so selected that they include the whole of the Epistles in question, and are almost perfect in execution, so that the learned world has here not only a new text of the Epistles which have been heretofore accessible only in Pococke and his copiers, but that text is practically the MS. itself. Dr. Hall has also printed an account of a new Syriac Lectionary in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* for 1884, pp. 220–223; and in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* for 1885 mentioned above (pp. 101–107) he has tabulated some "Variations in the same editions of certain Greek New Testaments" (chiefly with reference to Stephens' Greek-Latin of 1551), which it will repay Bibliographers to consult. In this latter Journal for 1884 (pp. 93–125), Dr. J. Isidore Mombert treats of certain parts of the history of the Latin Vulgate under the title, "Emendations and Corrections"; and in the issue for 1885 (pp. 28–48) Prof. Henry M. Harman discusses the Curetonian Syriac and compares its readings with typical Greek MSS.—concluding that it is older than the Peshitto and comes from the second century.

In Biblical Geography we may chronicle, first, the completion of the *edition de luxe* of Dr. Thompson's *The Land and the Book*, by the publication of the third volume, which treats of Lebanon, Damascus, and Beyond Jordan.[3] The illustrations are of the finest variety of American wood-engraving printed in the best style, and the text has been thoroughly revised and much enlarged. Dr. Hurlbut's *Manual*[4] is a successful effort to prepare a text-book of Biblical historical-geography on the model of the

[1] Boston: 1886. Pp. 91, 92.

[2] *Williams Manuscript. The Syrian Antilegomena Epistles, etc., written* 1471 *by Sulieman of Husn Keifa.* Edited by I. H. Hall. (Baltimore: Publication Agency of the Johns-Hopkins University. 1886. Folio. Pp. 7, and 17 plates.)

[3] New York: Harper & Bros. Square 8vo, with 147 illustrations and maps. Vol. i. treats of Southern Palestine and Jerusalem, and vol. ii. of Central Palestine and Phœnicia. Each volume is complete in itself.

[4] *Manual of Biblical Geography. A Text-Book of Bible History. . . . With maps, plans, review charts, coloured diagrams and illustrations.* By Rev. J. D. Hurlbut, D.D., with an Introduction by Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D. (Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co. 4to, pp. 158; 28 full-page coloured maps and many smaller ones.)

most advanced modern school-books. Outside such classes as the Chautauqua assembly gets together, however, the book is not apt to come into practical use; it is at once too elaborate and too primary—too elaborate for children and too primary for theological students. The opinion that the true site of Calvary is to be found on the hill above Jeremiah's Grotto—an opinion which has been rapidly gaining ground of late—is defended with arguments new and old by Dr. Selah Merrill in a recent paper.[1] He points out that this theory was broached as early as 1845 by Dr. Rufus Anderson, and was strongly argued by Thenius in 1849 and by Fisher Howe in 1871, before it received the able advocacy of Lieut. Conder in 1878.

It is seldom that so eminently satisfactory a book is given to the public as Dr. Frederic Gardiner's *The Old and New Testaments in their Mutual Relations*,[2] which is as simple and lucid in its style as it is learned and well-balanced in its matter. It has also the additional advantage of bringing together in orderly arrangement matter which is usually found only in separate works, and hence of filling a real gap in our theological literature. The subjects treated are such as the essential unity of the Old and New Testaments, the progressive character of Revelation, the Old Testament preparatory for the New, the relation of the precepts of the Law to the Gospel, sacrifice, the priesthood, the kingdom of God, prophecy, typology, the alleged "double sense" of Scripture, the New Testament testimony to the authorship of the Old Testament books, and the New Testament use of the Old. Where so much is brought together, each reader may expect to meet with some matters of detail with which he finds it difficult to agree; but no one will lay aside the book without a sense of obligation to its author. We apprehend that the apologetic purpose is the reigning one in Prof. John P. Peters' paper[3] on the Messianic hope; and it is good apologetic to assert only the minimum. But the value of this essay is sadly marred by the vein of naturalism that appears to run through it. His remarks scarcely leave room for a Divine element in the origin of Scripture, even in its prophetical parts, of other than a providential kind; while the chief elements of the Messianic hope are openly

[1] In *The Andover Review*, Boston, Nov., 1885. Pp. 383–488.

[2] New York: James Pott & Co. 1885. 12mo, pp. ix. 352.

[3] *Suggestions on the Rise and Development of the Messianic Hope*, in *The Andover Review*. (Boston, July, 1885. Pp. 75–86.)

traced to human origination. The expectation of an ideal David and an idealized kingdom of David, for instance, was in origin similar to the British belief in the return of an Arthur, or the German hope of the reappearance of Charlemagne or Friedrich Barbarossa; in each case there is only a longing metamorphosed into a hope—the hope is conceived by desire and born of adversity —which seems but a more literary way of saying that the wish was father to the thought. So far as this is a study of the growth of the hope in the popular mind, it contains much that is suggestive, though it still is a partial and incomplete view; but the prophetic utterances appear to be ranged as the effect rather than as the cause of the popular belief—they are not revelations, but only prepare for the Revelation to come. The analysis of the Messianic expectations prevalent in the time of our Lord, and the examination of the great facts of His life in their light, are the most valuable parts of the essay. But Jesus' relation to these expectations does not seem to us to be satisfactorily elucidated. He attached Himself thoroughly to them (we are told), and at the same time revolutionized them,—but revolutionized them only by going back to the hopes of an earlier time, by appealing, in accordance with a recognised right, from the current interpretation of authoritatively designated Messianic passages to the passages themselves. Jesus' use of the Old Testament passages in ordering His life and teaching, and the use of them by the New Testament writers in proof of His claims, are justified by the fact that such passages were at that time regarded as Messianic; "would it not be reasonable that God should cause His Messiah to fulfil, to some extent at least, these expectations of the Jews? and was it not even necessary to do so, in order to attach Him to the thought of the times?" This is simply accommodation: Jesus' acts were not, as the Gospel declares, in order that that might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophets, but in order that that might be fulfilled which was expected of the Messiah by the people.

The view of Rabbi Schindler,[1] of the origin of the Messianic idea, is not essentially different from Prof. Peters'; but he invites us to go with him a step further and listen to the story of its

[1] *Messianic Expectations and Modern Judaism.* By Solomon Schindler, of the temple Adath Israel in Boston; with an Introduction by Minot J. Savage. (Boston: S. E. Cassius & Co., 1886. 12mo, pp. x. 290.)

death. For ideas are as mortal as the men who framed them; and this idea has passed away with the unhealthy political circumstances out of which it grew, and on which it, like the fungus-disease it was, fed. Speaking in the name of Reformed Judaism, "there is not one of us," he says, "who expects the advent of a Messiah." It was unfortunate for the credit of the Rabbi as a critic and historian, that he was led to give an account of Jesus and the origin of Christianity as a part of the history of the Messianic idea. The whole performance is marked by the most astonishing disregard of the plainest rules of historical criticism; which results in his beginning by telling us unhistorically that we have no information as to Jesus or His life, and proceeding by very unhistorically indeed giving a detailed account of Him and His work, every important trait of which is in direct contradiction to the records which we have. The Rabbi invites us to a simple test of his book: "a jury," he says, "which finds the testimony of a witness unreliable in one point, generally throws out his testimony entirely; and so does the historian." But immediately before these words we read these sentences: "Only of late, a scrap of parchment has been discovered which contains a passage from one of the Gospels. Scientists place its age as far back as the third or fourth century. In it an important passage, relating to the promised return of Jesus, is entirely omitted, which would prove, if it proves anything, that still later than the fourth century, interpolations, if we shall not call them falsifications, of the original text must have taken place." This is the use the Rabbi would make of the famous Fayoum papyrus fragment. He calls it parchment; he mistakes the age of the document for the age of work written on it; he lessens this age a century silently—which strengthens his argument. But all this is nothing compared with the use made of the fragment. We might as well talk of our Gospels becoming "falsified" after the sixteenth century as after the fourth. We commend to the Rabbi a simple reading of Codex Vaticanus or Sinaiticus, or one of the second, third or fourth century versions.

Those who desire to follow the course of discussion concerning the Fayoum fragment which we have thus been brought to notice, may be directed to the admirable summary of it prepared by Prof. Woodruff,[1] who arrives for himself at the sound conclusion that

[1] *The El Fayoum MSS., with a Résumé of the Discussion of the Alleged Gos-*

the scrap contains a portion of a homily which quotes from our Gospels. Since he wrote, this same opinion has received the suffrages of Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, and may almost be now said to be the accepted view.

Among all the Harmonies of the Gospels, we confess to a preference for Robinson's. But its last revision dates as far back as 1851, and the book had become so antiquated in text as well as in some minor points in the discussions, that a new edition, thoroughly revised and brought up to date, has been for several years a recognised necessity. This revision and modernization has now been carried through with entire success, both in the Greek Harmony and in the English one, by Prof. Riddle.[1] The notes are thoroughly revised and somewhat extended in both. The text of the A.V. is retained in the English, but with readings from the Revised Version in the margin. The latest text of Tischendorf has been substituted for that of Hahn in the Greek. And altogether both books are put into a condition that makes "Robinson" once more the best Harmony accessible. It is, of course, well known that in these books the parallel passages of the Gospels are printed in full, side by side, in parallel columns. The less sound principle of blending the narratives together into a single account has been adopted by Mr. Cadman in his English Harmony;[2] though he has managed to print every word of each Evangelist.

Coming now to Commentaries, we may mention first the *Complete Commentary on the New Testament*, an important undertaking, under the general editorship of Professor Alvah Hovey, D.D., LL.D., and publishing at the American Baptist Publication Society at Philadelphia. The design of the work is to give English readers the results of modern scholarship, and it is to consist of

pel-Fragment. By Prof. Frank E. Woodruff, in *The Andover Review.* (Boston: September, 1885. Pp. 272–7.)

[1] *A Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek, newly arranged, with Explanatory Notes.* By Edward Robinson, D.D., LL.D. Revised edition . . . with additional notes by M. B. Riddle, D.D., Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1885. 8vo, pp. xxv. 273.) Also, *A Harmony of the Four Gospels in English, according to the Common Version, etc.* By Edward Robinson, D.D., LL.D. Revised edition, by M. B. Riddle, D.D., etc. (Boston: ditto, 1886.)

[2] *The Four in One. Christ in the Gospels; or, The Life of Our Lord in the Words of the Evangelists, etc.* By Jas. P. Cadman, A.M., with an Introduction by Rev. P. S. Henson, D.D. Second edition. (Chicago: 1885. 8vo, pp. xxiv. 378.)

a series of octavo volumes, the comments arranged at the bottom of a page which bears both the A. V. and Revised Version at the top. The volumes on Mark by W. E. Clarke, D.D., Acts by H. B. Hackett, D.D., Luke by George R. Bliss, D.D., and Revelation by Justin A. Smith, D.D. assisted by J. R. Boise, D.D., are already out. The latest issue is the volume on John's Gospel by the general editor, assisted in the text-critical portion by Dr. J. A. Broadus;[1] and a very excellent volume it makes, with about fifty pages of introduction, and a careful and readable commentary. Dr. Hovey is at his best in discussing the authorship of the fourth Gospel and its trustworthiness as a record of the discourses of Jesus, which two topics occupy most of the introduction. We observe that he too is on the wave which is bringing us back to the old opinion that the Apocalypse is later than the Gospel. His remark with reference to the difference in style is worth notice: "It is certainly credible that John's use of an acquired language may have been less careful at the greater age than it was at the less. When a man reaches an advanced period of life, he sometimes falls back in his forms of speech to the habits of youth." Nothing on John can supersede, however, the epoch-making work of Godet; and we have just welcomed the beginning of a very exact translation of its greatly improved third edition, from the competent hand of Dr. Timothy Dwight.[2] The volume which has appeared carries us to the end of chapter v. Dr. Dwight has added (pp. 512–559) a series of very thoughtful additional notes, and an essay entitled "Introductory Suggestions with Reference to the Internal Evidence" (pp. 493–521), which develops the ideas of testimony and personal experience running through the Gospel. On Paul's Epistles we have an excellent little book by Professor Boise, on Galatians and Romans,[3] which follows an earlier and similar volume on the Epistles of the first captivity, and which aims to do for students of these Epistles what school editions of the classics do for their authors. The notes are

[1] *Commentary on the Gospel of John.* By Alvah Hovey, D.D., LL.D. (Philadelphia: Am. Baptist Pub. Soc. [1886]. 8vo, pp. 423.)

[2] *Commentary on the Gospel of John, etc. By F. Godet.* Translated from the third French edition, with a preface, introductory suggestions, and additional notes, by Timothy Dwight. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1886. Vol. I. 8vo, pp. x. 559.)

[3] *Notes on Galatians and Romans, etc.* By James Robinson Boise, D.D., LL.D. (Chicago: American Publication Society of Hebrew. 1885. 12mo, pp. 176.)

thorough, and while entirely satisfactory for their purpose, are full of a sound exegesis that older students of these Epistles will find useful. A successful effort to annotate the whole New Testament for the cursory reader will be found in Dr. Howard Crosby's crisp and helpful book.[1]

We need to pause a moment, however, on Dr. James Freeman Clarke's translation of the ideas of Paul into modern forms of thought.[2] Earnest as the effort is, and sound as are its presuppositions,—that Paul delivers a teaching supernatural in its origin and pregnant in its form,—the book fails because the author is unable to liberate his exegesis from the *rôle* of handmaid to his preconceived opinions. In Dr. Clarke's hands Paul becomes only a somewhat unusually earnest modern unitarian; while the central ideas of the real Paul,—substitution, satisfaction, imputation, blood, atonement, and redemption, by which God made Him who knew no sin sin for us (2 Cor. v. 21), and refused, on the ground of His satisfaction, to account the trespasses that were our own to us (2 Cor. v. 19),—all these are translated entirely away. Although, however, he fails to understand what Paul means by preaching Christ as crucified (1 Cor. i. 23), or preaching Him as Lord (2 Cor. iv. 4), Dr. Clarke yet makes Christ the centre and end of all,—and this is much.

B. B. Warfield.

[1] *The New Testament in both Authorized and Revised Versions, etc.* (Boston: Chas. F. Alden & Co.)

[2] *The Ideas of the Apostle Paul, Translated into their Modern Equivalents.* By James Freeman Clarke. (Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. Crown 8vo, pp. xiv. 436.)

ESTHER.

THE history of the century succeeding the return of the Jews from exile is contained in the three books which in the English Bible stand immediately after the other historical books, and in the contemporary prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. It is from the brief narratives of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther that we must gather our information regarding the long period which elapsed from the first return of the captives under Zerubbabel to the return of Nehemiah, nearly a hundred years after. And these books themselves rather bridge the century with one span than lead us through it. They concentrate attention on the first return, in the year 538 B.C., and on the final returns in 458 and 446, but of the intervening years they have nothing to say. And not only so, but they depict only the fortunes of those who returned to Jerusalem, and have nothing to tell us of that larger part of the nation which remained in exile. This blank of eighty years is annoying, and lends an enhanced value to the little book of Esther, which alone relieves it. Only from this remarkable episode, occurring in the year 482 B.C., can we learn anything of the condition, habits, thoughts, hopes of the Jews during this century.

That there should not have been much to tell of the Jews who had returned to their own land is not surprising. There would necessarily fall to the lot of the first generation much work that was merely mechanical or manual, building houses, reclaiming lands, organizing the Temple services and the municipal government. Owing to such

causes, the history of some of our own most vigorous colonies has been for the first hundred years of their existence devoid of interest to the world at large. Much too depends on the leader of a colony, and Zerubbabel was not a man to make a deep mark on history. He seems to have had little of the martial vigour of the first conqueror of the land, and little of the legislative capacity of the leader of the earlier exodus. Under the Persian government, as under our own, native princes were often allowed to retain their crown and much of their local authority, as vassals of the empire. But from this time, instead of any revival of the glories of the old Jewish monarchy, the royal line of native princes disappears; and the high priesthood remains the one Jewish hereditary dignity.

But if in Jerusalem the hereditary leaders were timorous and languid, the story of Mordecai and Esther is evidence that there was abundant vigour and self-reliance among the Jews who remained in captivity. The risks to which the Jew has at all times been exposed among foreigners, the self-possessed courage and ruthless strategy with which he meets these dangers, his scorn of other races, and his skilful employment of them to his own ends, his loyalty to his own people, the tenacity of his faith, were never more conspicuous than in this story. That the Jews were numerous in Shushan will naturally be inferred from the dismay with which the announcement of their intended massacre was received. "The city Shushan was perplexed." That they had already amassed considerable wealth appears from Haman's promise to the king that their confiscated goods would yield for his treasury the enormous sum of ten thousand talents.

But the intention of the book was in all probability not to picture the condition of the Jews, nor to save from oblivion a story whose plot rivals the most ingenious fiction, but to account for the origin of one of the later Jewish

feasts, the feast of Purim or Lots. This feast commemorated the great deliverance recorded in the book of Esther, and it took its name from the circumstance that Haman made use of the lot to ascertain what was the most auspicious day for the execution of his bloody design against the Jews. It was probably on this account that the book was admitted into the canon. The deliverance of the Jews from massacre was thought to be worthy of commemoration in a festival; but without a historical document, giving a clear account of its origin, it would have inevitably become an unmeaning celebration. It seems that the book of Esther is still read in the synagogue at the annual feast. On the other hand, the existence of the feast of Purim is evidence of the historical character of the book, as the annually diminishing gathering of the veterans of Waterloo is evidence that such a battle took place and was an English victory.

Surprise has commonly been expressed at the reticence of the book. No allusion is made to the hand of God guiding the complication of interests and aims to an issue favourable to the Jews. The joy of the rescued is dwelt upon; most emphatically is it said that "the Jews had gladness and joy, a feast and a good day"; but not a word of thankfulness to God is heard throughout the rejoicing. The motive of the book is patriotic, not religious. This would seem to be a note of the Jews of the Dispersion. They "learnt by degrees to keep back the expression of their religious convictions, to assimilate themselves externally to their masters, to eliminate from their ordinary discourse all that would mark them for Jews, while they clung internally to their old belief and practised secretly their old customs." They cultivated, in short, that moody reserve which was construed into a hatred of the human race, and which brought upon them many a persecution well-nigh as bloody as that which Haman devised. This

reticence may perhaps be accepted as a sign that the book was written in a country where such reticence was practised, and is not a romance composed by an inhabitant of Judah for the glorification of his people.

But while certainly there are few obtrusive exhibitions of religious belief or feeling in the book, it must not be overlooked that the antagonism of Haman to the Jews, and all the plotting and counterplotting which sprang from it, was excited by Mordecai's stubborn adherence to a religious scruple. The reverence he was required to pay to Haman was such as his conscience would not permit him to pay. This is shown in Mordecai's prayer, recorded in another ancient narrative of these events, and in which he is represented as saying: "Thou knowest all things, and Thou, Lord, knowest that it was neither in contempt nor pride, nor from any desire of glory, that I did not bow down before proud Haman. For I could have been content, for the salvation of Israel, with goodwill to kiss the soles of his feet. But what I did, I did that I might not prefer the glory of man above the glory of God; neither will I worship any but Thee, O God." This is borne out by Mordecai's reply to those who found fault with his conduct. He was a Jew, he said; and this excuse had so much plausibility in it as prompted his interrogators to make inquiry whether it was altogether valid. Haman too sought to destroy, not only Mordecai, but all his race, proving that he understood that his creed was at the bottom of his insubordination, and that any Jew might show the same spirit and plead the same excuse. It was, in fact, a kind of St. Bartholomew's Day which Haman aimed at, an extinction of this people who by their stiff, religious scruples had forced him to see that, whatever rank he might hold, he should never be lord of their conscience.

Though the heroine of the tale is Esther, the other prominent characters are drawn with life-like touches.

Ahasuerus, the Xerxes of European historians, who invaded Greece with unparalleled pomp and was so gallantly repelled, appears here the same self-willed and yet facile, amorous, and changeable despot as secular history depicts. The want of self-respect and consideration for the feelings of others, the vanity and coarseness of nature shown in his proposing to exhibit his queen to the gaze of his half or whole drunk guests, the facility with which he lends himself to the crafty Haman's plot, and the rage with which he discovers that he has been duped, are characteristic of the man. Characteristic also is the readiness with which he gave orders that all the Jews should be massacred, and the dismay with which he found that his own decree, which he had forgotten as soon as made, came back and laid a bloody hand on the woman he held in his arms as his surest possession. Haman too, compelled to exchange places with the man he hated, to pay to him the honours he expected to receive himself, and to be hanged before his own household on the gallows he had erected for his victim, presents the very ideal of retribution, and is gibbeted as the very type of the over-clever men who fall into the pit they have digged for others. Mordecai again, who is the moving spring of the whole drama, is every inch a Jew, affectionate to his own kindred, loyal to his own people, daring, self-reliant, resolute, full of resources, and shrinking from nothing which might forward his purpose.

It was the beauty of Esther which saved the Jews from massacre. Her beauty might indeed have merely graced an obscure Jewish household, had not the king, flushed with wine, issued his insulting order to Vashti. Her beauty might have gradually and ignobly faded in the palace had not Mordecai and Haman quarrelled. Still it was Esther's beauty which fought for the Jews at this critical juncture. In one of the Jewish writings which relate to this period of history, we read that three of the young men of Darius'

bodyguard entertained him one night, when like Xerxes he was sleepless, by discussing what is the mightiest force in the world. The first held that wine was strongest, the second maintained that the king was the mightiest power, but the third (who was Zerubbabel the Jewish prince) is reported to have said, "Women are strongest; but above all things truth bears away the victory." Pascal, the most serious of writers, gives us abundant food for reflection by the bare statement of a historical fact when he says, "If Cleopatra's nose had been shorter, the whole face of the world would have been altered." The beauty of Esther was the only weapon required by God at this time for the rescue of His people.

But Esther was no mere painted puppet in the hand of God. Without courage of the highest kind and acceptance of responsibility as heroic as Judith's or Deborah's, she could not have become the saviour of her people. This courageous and devoted acceptance of the responsibility attaching to her gifts and her position is the noteworthy feature in Esther's character. She was but beginning life, and she was no doubt beginning life with the same feelings as other young people who are conscious of some superiority to the ordinary lot. Innocently conscious of her beauty, breathing the exhilarating atmosphere of deference and admiring regard which her loveliness everywhere produced, she might readily have accepted the life of luxury and intrigue to which she seemed destined. Her elevation was sufficiently intoxicating. Two or three months ago a secluded girl, she is suddenly raised to a position higher than that of any woman on earth. Naturally at Mordecai's first summons she was unwilling to listen. Naturally she at first resented that so heavy a responsibility, so fearful a risk, should attach to her elevation. She could not help being queen. She had not thrust herself into the position. Was the dignity of it at once to turn into responsibility,

its elevation to prove the mere pinnacle from which she might cast herself in the hope of saving others?

To the aid of her better impulses came love of Mordecai, and that true-hearted loyalty to her people which the manners of a splendid court had not deadened in her, and which nothing seems to extinguish in the heart of a Jew. Esther was not of the breed of those who spurn the ladder by which they have climbed to high place. She did not ask her ladies who that Jewish-looking person was who day by day haunted the palace gates. She thought with fond gratitude of the man who had brought up the little orphan, and she fearlessly proclaimed herself a Jewess when her people could be saved by the disclosure. Age does not always meet with its deserts at the hands of youth. The young feel at times keenly the awkwardness of acknowledging parents who have raised their children to a much higher social position than their own. They forget how much they owe to their parents, and are merely annoyed with the awkwardness of manner which measures the interval through which the parents have lifted their children, and with the dulness of an intellect and the infirmities of a body worn out in their service. There are happily many Esthers among us: but there are also many Lear's daughters.

In Esther's person, then, female beauty found its pre-eminent opportunity of proving itself to be of God and for God. Every natural gift brings its responsibility, and has its opportunity of furthering what is good. And this was the opportunity which suddenly emerged for the beauty of woman to redeem itself from all the slurs and suspicions cast upon it, and to show that, not only can it add a pleasure to social intercourse, but may on occasion be the one fit instrument for effecting a heroic purpose. And if a gift apparently so secular and so slightly connected with the character of its owner may yet be the medium for most

severely testing the moral state, and affording it the opportunity for its highest exercise, what other natural gift may not similarly be such a medium? Whether therefore we have quickness of feeling and ready sympathy, a nimble fancy, humour, ready speech, or any aptitude for moving among men with ease and influence; or whether we have a vigorous constitution, great powers of endurance and of work, or any gift by the help of which we know we can get a little way ahead of our neighbours in some one direction, —then the proper ballast which will keep us steady in our course and save us from shipwreck is the recognition that every personal endowment brings with it a proportionate responsibility, and that the time will come for us also to determine whether our gifts are to be used for our own advantage and glorification, or for the welfare of others.

Esther was apparently an affectionate, patriotic, noble-minded woman, and yet her first impression was that it would be better for her to skulk in her guarded elevation and suffer her kinsmen to be massacred. That is to say, her first idea was that it was better to lose the opportunity of saving many thousand lives, the opportunity which alone ennobled her life, and suddenly lifted it out of the common and undistinguished herd of eastern princesses to a place among the world's heroines. And we are often more than on the brink, as she was, of throwing away in our selfish fears our best opportunities. We refuse to recognise that if we cannot brave a danger, or run a risk, or make a real sacrifice, or forego a selfish advantage, neither can we win the crown of life. If the scale always turns with us in favour of comfort and security, if the conventions and regularities of respectable life always outweigh the real needs and calls of our fellow men, then must we be content with a useless, discredited, artificial, untrue life. If we find that through all we do we are chiefly influenced by selfish considerations, we should pass on ourselves the judgment

we should have passed on Esther had she weakly declined to take her life in her hand and seek to reverse the decree of the haughtiest despot in the world.

The true note of heroism is struck by Esther in the words, "If I perish, I perish." She takes her life in her hand, and goes where duty calls. Her words reveal a mind that clearly apprehends the risk, but is made up to run it. It may be she will not succeed, but the attempt must be made. It may be she is uselessly throwing away her life, but the cause deserves her life. "If I perish, I perish." This, I say, is the note of heroism. For where there is no heroism, the risk will not be run. The probabilities of success are weighed and reweighed, and meanwhile the opportunity is past. We shrink from taking action in this or that cause, because success is not certain, because it is quite possible that the only result may be our own discomfiture, loss, ruin. With the heroic soul the question is, Ought the thing to be accomplished? is the end supremely desirable? is the cause a good one? The prospects of success may be doubtful, but the risk must be run. Thus only are great steps taken. We in this country have much need of some heroic souls who, not through imitation or from vainglory, but pressed by the weight of their country's burdens and dangers, give themselves to the task of wiping out national sin and checking national decline. Never has heroism been far to seek in our country; in ordinary circumstances and family life there is abundance of it: what we need is the heroism that can make a stand and a sacrifice for the best interests of the people.

Among the most striking features of this graphic narrative is the unobtrusiveness of the Providence which guides to the one desired issue all the plotting and counterplotting of the various actors in the drama. The interest and significance of this passage in Jewish history arise from the impression it leaves, that even when men are most freely

and busily bent, each on his own purpose, they are yet controlled by an unseen will. The rapidly succeeding emotions and hurry of events, the drunken freak of Xerxes and his exasperation at being thwarted, the arrogance and vindictiveness of Haman and the craft of his friends, the king's opportune sleeplessness and Mordecai's accidental over-hearing of a conversation, were so combined that results contemplated by none of them were accomplished. The human agents alone were in direct contact with the events; there is no miraculous, unaccountable interposition, no falling back on the devices of a weak dramatist, no earthquake, no eclipse, no break in the chain of merely human and ordinary motive and action; yet the coincidences are so numerous, so surprising, and so fruitful, that the reader, when he comes to the close, can scarcely avoid sitting with the book open before him, and feeling that behind all this there is a power governing all. He is conscious that to close the book with the remark, "That is an extraordinary story," is not a satisfactory criticism, and leaves something unaccounted for. It is true there is no obtrusion of this "something more." The whole story can be told, and in fact is told, without any allusion to higher agencies than the figures on the board. And this is as it should be. God is in the background in the story, because He is in the background in life. He is "through all," "over all." As the invisible force of attraction holds together all things, and keeps them in their due place whether at rest or in motion, so this unseen power that concerns itself with human affairs guides without constraining, and through the free planning and passions of men accomplishes its own wise and beneficent purpose.

MARCUS DODS.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

I AM asked to criticise Dr. Sanday's luminously written papers on the origin of the Christian ministry. As I understand my task, it is not to offer an independent opinion on the same subject, but to criticise the account that he has given.

And as I may be supposed to have been asked to do this because I had the premature courage to break a lance on the same field of battle against Dr. Hatch's *Bampton Lectures*, perhaps I may begin by saying that I have no quarrel with Dr. Sanday's criticism on that attempt.

Next let me notice Dr. Sanday's preliminary statement of recent theories—Lightfoot's, Hatch's, Harnack's—in their continuity, only to express the gratitude all must feel for its clearness and carefulness, as a piece of literary history.

It is interesting, with reference to the history of opinion, to learn that Dr. Hatch did not mean "to lay any exclusive or even especial stress upon the financial character of the ἐπίσκοποι." Perhaps his explanation given to Dr. Sanday and his communication to Dr. Harnack (see *Dogmengeschichte*, bk. i., p. 155, note 1) may allow us to suppose that he would not, since the discovery of the *Didaché*, even take substantial exception to the position of the latter that "the Episcopi and Diaconi were primarily officers of worship," or at least that "their functions were as wide as the system of functions comprised in the community—care of the poor, worship, correspondence; in a word, administration in the general sense of the term" (*Texte u. Untersuch.*, ii., 2, p. 144).

But we may notice that Dr. Harnack expresses an opinion somewhat different from that which Dr. Hatch communicated to Dr. Sanday (p. 22, note 1 (3)), on the question whether the Episcopi were *permanent* officers

from the first in the Christian community.[1] As elected, the Presbyters, he thinks, were without doubt removable. But as endowed with a special "charisma," the Episcopi and Deacons exercised a ministry which was "almost without control, and ranked as charismatic. Hence it is without doubt that the officers in the Christian communities occupied from the first a position altogether different from that which they held in the *θίασος*." (*Analecten zu Hatch*, p. 235.)

It should of course be borne in mind that Dr. Harnack's views are based upon conclusions as to the authorship and date of the Pastoral Epistles and Acts, as well as other New Testament documents, from which Dr. Sanday dissents, holding the ancient position, and on which Dr. Hatch has never expressed his mind clearly.

I leave the history of modern opinion, and come to the paper in which Dr. Sanday speaks "more directly in his own person." Here first let me express substantial agreement with what Dr. Sanday says (pp. 23–28, div. I.) on the origin of the name and office of the *ἐπίσκοπος*. Plainly however the contemporary use of the term to describe officers of guilds or clubs, and the use in the LXX., are influences not mutually exclusive. Scriptural authority and contemporary usage would have combined to determine the

[1] As bearing on this question Dr. Hatch (*Bampton Lectures*, v., note 51) has called attention to a fifth-century Galatian sepulchral inscription (*δὶς γενόμενος πρεσβύτερος*). I do not think it is fair to quote only these words. The man there buried—Tarasis by name—is described as *δὶς τενομενος* (sic) *πρεσβ*$^{\text{ς}}$ *και παραμοναριος παροικησας εν τω τοπω τουτω*. The *παραμονάριος* or (more commonly) *προσμονάριος* is the Latin *mansionarius* (see canon 2 of Chalcedon, and Bright's *Notes*, p. 129 seq.). He is a "residentiary" in charge of some institution belonging to the Church. This Tarasis was twice appointed "presbyter and residentiary" (of a particular church or monastery). Is this a basis for a theory of double ordinations, otherwise unheard of in the Church? If the words "*δὶς . . . πρεσβύτερος*" had stood alone, as Dr. Hatch quotes them, I should have preferred to understand them in the light of the schismatical re-ordinations of the Arian and Donatist bodies. Cf. *Libellus Precum Faustini*, etc. (*Bibl. vet. Patr.*, v., p. 659 B.) "egregius ille bis episcopus." Tombstone inscriptions, one may notice, have in all ages expressed the ideas of a lax popular theology. Recent investigations in Egypt, Syria, and Asia emphasise this.

choice of the term; and the term, quite vague in itself, would have got a new Christian connotation from the first, in proportion as the Christian society was conscious in itself of being a new thing, demanding a novel sort of superintendence.

As a matter of fact, the earliest use of the term ἐπίσκοπος certainly suggests "pastoral" functions, functions, that is, of a spiritual order. If the salutation in Philippians i. 1 has no implication, if "taking care of the Church of God" (1 Tim. iii. 5) is indefinite, yet the ideal of the Episcopus in Titus i. 7 as "the steward of God" carries unmistakably spiritual associations (cf. Luke xii. 42), and must be taken with the not less unmistakable language of Acts xx. 28, where the episcopate is coincident with the "pastoral care." And St. Peter's language about God as "Shepherd and Episcopus of souls," or in His relation to the ministry as "chief Shepherd" (1 Pet. ii. 25, v. 4), suggests the same idea of general spiritual supervision. The Episcopi, in fact, "watched for souls as they that shall give account." In the *Didaché* the Episcopi and Deacons are to be elected with special reference to the Church worship, and to that spiritual ministry of the Prophets and Teachers in which they have a real though a subordinate share (cap. xv. 1; see Sanday, pp. 14, 15). In the *Epistle of Clement* the characteristic function of the Episcopus is not more the ministering to the flock of Christ than it is the presidency of worship, which is expressed in the "offering of the gifts."[1] This sort of language seems to me very much too clear in its implications to allow of Dr. Sanday saying that "before the *Ignatian Epistles* there is only very slight evidence that either the Christian Presbyter or Bishop exercised what we should call spiritual functions" (p. 32).

[1] See Harnack on this phase, *Texte* u.s.w., p. 144, note 73: "Beyond a doubt the προσφέρειν δῶρα τῷ Θεῷ in the sense of the offering the sacrifices (*Opferdarbringung*) appears as the most important function of the Episcopus."

I think such functions are necessarily involved in the pastoral care or stewardship of God, understood in a Christian sense. If by "spiritual functions" is meant the conduct of worship or performance of sacramental acts, all the presumption is in favour of supposing, where there is no positive evidence, that such functions fell to the local ministers in the absence of the higher orders. It is a spiritual ministry after all, though accompanied by physical effect, that the Presbyters perform for the sick man in St. James v. 14. Again, the evidence of the *Didaché*[1] and St. Clement's epistle cannot be said to suggest the idea that liturgical functions were a recent addition to episcopal duties and privileges. Of course the local minister had not at first much of the teaching office. But a ministry can be spiritual without a large measure of that, and there is really no evidence at all that an Episcopus would not from the first have been required to be "apt to teach" (1 Tim. iii. 2).

I pass to Dr. Sanday's second head (II., p. 28), "the non-equivalence of the terms ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος." Here again I can agree substantially with him. It is curious to find Dr. Harnack, from the point of view of the most advanced criticism, reviving in a new form a distinction only recently abandoned by the most conservative. The idea is in itself attractive. It may be urged on its behalf that something must be involved in difference of name, and something in the closer connexion of the Deacon with the Episcopus than with the Presbyter. "It must be wrong," we may allow ourselves to say with Dr. Sanday, "to press the identification too closely." But on the other hand, all the positive evidence of the first century documents requires us to recognise it as substantially true that the Presbyters (in the official sense) and the Episcopi were in fact the same

[1] No argument can be drawn from the exhortation "not to despise (overlook) the bishops" (*Did.* xv. 2), any more than from the parallel exhortation, "Despise not *prophesyings*" (1 Thess. v. 20).

persons—nay more, that the offices were regarded as identical. This is involved in the "quite unequivocal" transitions from one name to the other in Acts xx. 17 and Titus i. 5–7.[1] And if the offices are identical in the Epistle to Titus, can we argue that they are distinct in the epistles to Timothy? Nowhere, again, do we find the two offices mentioned as co-existing in distinction. We have Presbyters mentioned in St. James, Episcopi in the Church of Philippi. No doubt St. Paul had ordained Presbyters there as elsewhere, but no salutation is sent to them as distinct persons. Episcopi, again, are mentioned in the *Didaché*, but no Presbyters. On the whole, Dr. Sanday meets the theory with a modified negative, and the evidence will not certainly allow us to meet it with anything nearer to acceptance.

Now I come to Dr. Sanday's third head, "the account that is given of the origin of the more spiritual functions of the Christian ministry, and their gradual transition to the officers who now exercise them" (p. 31). Here I can agree in the main with the significance which Dr. Sanday attributes to the *Didaché*—a document which, however inadequate in its doctrine, is an important witness in the department of Church history; but I have already expressed disagreement as to the unspiritual character of the functions of the primitive ἐπίσκοπος, and in other ways Dr. Sanday seems here to neglect important considerations. Let us see how the matter stands.

The earliest Church ministry broadly divides itself into the apostolic or general, on the one hand, and the local, on the other. The apostolic ministry is engaged in the preaching of the gospel. When St. Paul declares this to be his characteristic duty (1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 14), he is saying

[1] The identity of the offices seems implied in St. Peter. The Presbyter is the "shepherd," and the Chief Shepherd is also "Bishop of souls" (1 Pet. v. 1–4, ii. 25).

about his apostolic office what a local Presbyter-Episcopus could not have said: this commission to preach the gospel carries with it, not only the founding of Churches, but the ordaining of the local ministry, and the subsequent jurisdiction over them. When moreover the Apostle is on the spot, he supersedes the local officers in the ordinary ministration of the "breaking of the bread." To the local ministry of Presbyter-Episcopi and Deacons, on the other hand, falls the administration of local affairs, of discipline and worship. There is no reason to doubt that it involved also from the first a certain degree of teaching authority, though, as we shall see, this function would probably in the main have belonged to "the Prophets." When however we have learnt from the Epistle to Timothy that, on the one hand, the Episcopus was to be "apt to teach" (1 Tim. iii. 2), while, on the other hand, there were Presbyters who seemingly did not teach (1 Tim. v. 17), we have pretty well come to the end of our evidence on this subject.

So far we have spoken of the Apostles as the chief representatives of the general ministry; but there are associated with them alike in the Acts and in the epistles of St. Paul the dimmer figures of Prophets, Teachers, and Evangelists. Amongst these the Acts would lead us to suppose difference of functions existed. The "Evangelist" Philip has not the power to impart the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. The "Prophets and Teachers," on the other hand, at Antioch both exercise the ministry of worship and "lay on hands."[1] Barnabas and

[1] In what sense exactly need not be here discussed. St. Paul and St. Barnabas, who are Prophets in xiii. 1 are "Apostles" in xvi. 4; but St. Paul's language (Gal. i. 1), and the whole idea of the apostolate, would seem to preclude our supposing that he was *made an Apostle* by laying on of hands, in such sense as the grace of his order was in St. Timothy by the laying on of St. Paul's hands. But the apostolate was an office apart, and the laying on of hands, which at least gave Church ratification to St. Paul and St. Barnabas' mission, could have been performed only by those who were recognised as holding the function of ordaining to Church offices. The function of the prophetic office

Saul come under that head (Acts xiii. 1), and presumably at least Apollos. In fact, the apostolic office must be taken to include Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers. They together form the general ministry. The Church is built upon the foundation of "Apostles and Prophets,"—"Apostles and Prophets" have received the message (Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5). It should be noted that in the *Teaching of the Apostles*, amongst the "early Syriac Documents," "the Apostles" who originate "the ordination to the priesthood" are reckoned as "seventy-two" in number, and include St. Luke (*ad fin.*).

Of this broad distinction of the general and local ministry, of the existence of Prophets and Teachers side by side with the Apostles, and of the use of the term Apostle in a general as well as a special sense (Rom. xvi. 7), we had been conscious before the publication of the *Didaché*. What the *Didaché* has done for us is to supply a "missing link" in the history of the development of the sub-apostolic ministry by bringing out into clearer light the dim figures of the Prophets (or Apostles in a general sense) and Teachers. We see these "apostolic men"—men of the general ministry—fulfilling a very important office in the period of transition between the apostolic age and the Church of the later second century. Assuming that the *Didaché* represents a state of things in the last thirty years of the first century (probably in an out-of-the-way district), we find at that epoch side by side with, or rather above, the local ministry of Bishops and Deacons, a still general or errant ministry—with a considerable admixture of impostors in its ranks—in which the Prophets are the most clearly depicted figures.

in ordination (1 Tim. iv. 14, διά) is not quite clear. But we find the word ἐπιστηρίζειν, which seems to have a technical sense in connexion with apostolic visits (and with the "imparting of spiritual gifts" presumably by the laying on of hands?) used of "prophets" as well as apostles (Acts xv. 32, cf. xiv. 22; xv. 41, xviii. 23, cf. Rom. i. 11).

These Prophets, with their untrammelled right of "extempore prayer," supersede the local ministry in the celebration of the Eucharist where they are present. They are "the high priests" of the Christian communities. The "ministry of the word" is mainly in their hands. This picture may be compared with Eusebius' account of the activity of "Evangelists" in the sub-apostolic age, who, "holding the first rank of the succession to the Apostles"—*i.e.* immediately succeeding them in their general missionary functions,—went about as preachers, founding new Churches, ordaining local pastors, and passing on, themselves, into new fields (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 37; *cf.* iii. 20, Hegesippus' expression about the "kinsmen of the Lord," *ἡγήσασθαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*). So far I can agree with Dr. Sanday.

But I cannot but feel that he has an insufficient sense of the fundamental unity between the general and the local ministry and the close dependence of the latter on the former. For instance, the *Didaché* contemplates a Prophet settling in a Church (cap. xiii.). It goes on to speak of him as receiving as his due the tithes and firstfruits, because he is the Christians' high priest. When he was in the church he ministered the Eucharist. Can we doubt that on "settling" he would become the supreme pastor, or Bishop, in the sense (broadly) of Ignatius and Irenæus? Is it not, from the point of view of the *Didaché*, almost certain that the settling of prophets was an element at least in the formation of the episcopate in the later sense. What, in fact, was James but a prototype of the Apostle or Prophet who "settled" instead of moving about? What are Timothy and Titus, but men of the general apostolic and prophetic order, temporarily at least settled at Ephesus and in Crete, and exercising while they remained the functions of diocesan Bishops? Does not this settling of Prophets account in part for the episcopate being conceived of in the *Clementines*, in Irenæus, and in Hippolytus,

mainly as the "chair of the Teacher," having the *charisma veritatis*, the prophetic "high priesthood"? Now supposing the prophetic order to have "settled" into being presidents of the local episcopate, and become in a while *monepiscopi*, or Bishops in the later sense (by a change in the use of a title, facilitated, we may suppose, by St. John's influence in appointing single "Bishops" in the Churches of Asia), there would have been here no change of ministry, but an exercise of the same ministry (fundamentally) under changed conditions. The relation of Presbyter and Deacons to the diocesan Bishop was not fundamentally different from their earlier relation to the "apostolic man" or Prophet, the Timothy or Titus, when he was present.[1]

Perhaps this sense of the connexion in the sub-apostolic age of the local with a still enduring "general" ministry may throw light upon the phenomena of the *Epistle of Clement*. Clement, at Rome, in his relation to foreign Churches, in his teaching office, in his freedom of prayer (if we may assume that the end of the epistle represents his free liturgical prayer gradually taking fixed shape and outline), has something perhaps of the office of a Prophet. *At Corinth* there are no indications of any one, or any body of men, above the Presbyter-Episcopi. But there are indistinct forms in the background of the scene. Who are

[1] Timothy and Titus ordained the local ministry by the laying on of hands. There is no mention in the *Didaché* of the "Prophets" ordaining the Episcopi and Deacons. But (1) the Acts and Clement's epistle both represent these officers as appointed *from above* (Acts xiv. 23; Clem. 44). (2) The narrative in Acts xiii. 1 represents the Prophet and Teacher as sharing the apostolic function of laying on of hands. (3) The implication of the Pastoral Epistles suggests the same idea. (4) The silence of the *Didaché*, both about "ordination" and about the "laying on of hands" which followed baptism (and which Heb. vi. 2 assures us was as a "first principle" in Jewish Christian communities) may be accounted for by the fact that the *Didaché* is a manual of directions only for the functions of the community, and does not presume to give directions for what was reserved for the *general* ministry.

the "men of distinction" (cap. xliv.) who in the interval since the apostolic age have appointed the Presbyters with the consent of the Church? Who are the "leaders" (*οἱ ἡγουμένοι, οἱ προηγουμένοι*) who are coupled on two occasions with the Presbyters, and are mentioned first, as superiors of the Church, who are to be objects of reverence? Does again the analogy of the high priest, priests, and levites in the Jewish Church suggest a high priesthood in the Christian Church, like that which is presented to us in the *Didaché*—a prophetic high-priesthood, such as Hippolytus sees in the episcopate later on? It seems at least possible that in Greece at the time of Clement's, or even of Polycarp's, epistle, the "general" ministry of Prophets and Teachers still held the first rank, and appears somewhat dimly in the background of the scene.

However this may be, and it is certainly no more than a tenable hypothesis, at least the unity of the apostolic and prophetic ministry with the local is involved in the principle of the ministerial succession. Traditional Episcopacy has, it may be, in an uncritical age, written a rather "ideal" history of the development of the ministry, but it seems to me to have been true to fact in one, and that the most important, way. It had got hold of the principle of succession; and I do not think most modern critics are inclined to recognise how strong the conception of ministerial succession was from the first. We find it in Irenæus and Tertullian, with emphasis thrown upon it, at the latter part of the second century, and uncontested. It was present in the middle of the second century, when Hegesippus made his lists of the succession (*Euseb.* iv. 22). It is present in the Epistle of Clement. Clement does not verbally seem to make the Apostles have any successors to their *own* office—they stand as Moses to the Aaronic priesthood (cap. xlii.–xliv.); but he does make the ministry of his time to derive from the apostolic fount, to

be the outcome of that one mission, by which "Christ is from God, and the Apostles from Christ." The principle of succession is this: that no ministerial act is legitimate or "valid" (with secure ratification), except such as is done under commission, such as is covered by the commission received or implied at ordination—a commission which is directly or indirectly from the original apostolic authority. To that principle Clement, it seems to me, and Ignatius would have given their assent. When we go back to the New Testament, we seem to find, beyond a doubt, the idea that Christ instituted His Church with this broad and permanent differentiation of functions: there were to be pastors and their flocks, stewards and members of the household.[1] I cannot see that this distinction can be missed in the Acts of the Apostles; and the Acts interprets the Gospels, if these are supposed to admit of doubt. This pastorate or stewardship belonged, in the first instance, to the Apostles. It seems to have been understood to belong also to "Prophets and Teachers"; not only those who, like Timothy and Titus, were ordained by an Apostle and belong to the second generation, but to those also who were understood, in virtue of supernatural endowment, to be acting under Divine authorization, and to be part (so to speak) of the original equipment of the Church. But in the second stage the ministry was an imparted thing—a thing received from apostolic men. This truth seems to me to be as plain as can be on the surface of the narrative of the Acts, and to be involved indubitably in the Pastoral Epistles, which Dr. Sanday accepts. So far as prophetic gifts linger on in the Church, they are found, as in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, in a subordinate place; at least, they do not claim to usurp the functions of the regular ministry. Of course there is nothing about this succession in the *Didaché*.

[1] See Godet's note on St. Luke xii. 42.

But one who holds Dr. Sanday's position with reference to the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles and the Acts must interpret the anonymous document with all its ambiguities in the light of those which are of so much greater authority; and of such interpretation the *Didaché* is quite patient. A probable reason has already been pointed out why nothing should be said in the *Didaché* about the laying on of hands by the Prophets, if they are the ordainers; and they themselves may either have been ordained like Timothy and Titus, or may belong to the original ministry. At least, the question seems to turn, not on the *Didaché*, so much as on the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles.

The Apostles and original Prophets then ordained Episcopi and Deacons, and these Episcopi shared essentially that stewardship, that pastorate which Christ had instituted. Surely the essential unity of the office of Apostles and the local ministry is implied in St. Peter's language (1 Pet. v. 1–5), where he classes himself with the Presbyters; in St. Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders; in the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the same word is used (xiii. 7, 17) of those who originally delivered the Message and those who now "watch for the souls" of the Hebrew Christians; in the words of the *Didaché*, "Elect for yourselves Bishops and Deacons, . . . for they too minister for you the ministry of the Prophets and Teachers: . . . they are your honoured ones,[1] with the Prophets and Teachers." And surely it is impossible to doubt that St. Paul would have applied what he says about himself as a "steward" (1 Cor. iv. 1) to the "stewards" whom he directs Titus to ordain (Tit. i. 7). The function of the Apostles' office which perished with them was the *original* proclamation of the gospel, the *original* foundation of the Churches and their ministry.

[1] *I.e.*, your regular officers, who receive the τιμὴ καθήκουσα (*Clem.* i.).

There is then, it seems, one ministry, which Christ instituted, with varying functions, of which the "Apostles and Prophets" were the primary representatives, and in which other men, and men of subsequent ages, share only so far as they have received commission directly or indirectly from the Apostles. So that "no man taketh the ministerial honour" to himself seems a principle of the new covenant as much as of the old. It is recognised in the New Testament. It is recognised in Clement as really as in Irenæus or in Cyprian.[1] Thus I cannot agree with Dr. Sanday that when the Montanists claimed a "priesthood of enthusiasm," which should be able to dispense with the ministry received by succession, they were making a claim which scriptural authority would justify. Nor does it seem as if they laid any stress on tradition. "It was this element of conservatism in it," Dr. Sanday says, "the fact that it spoke the language and re-affirmed the ideas of a bygone day, that gave Montanism its strength, and won over to it so powerful a champion as Tertullian." Such language seems to me to be quite contrary to the main indications of history. If one reads Tertullian's *De Virginibus Velandis*, cap. i., he must be struck with its unconservative tone. Tertullian the Catholic is *conservative* with reference alike to doctrine and ministry in the *De Præscriptionibus*. Ter-

[1] Dr. Lightfoot says that Dr. Langen (*Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, p. 95 seq.) "gives an account of the origin of episcopacy precisely similar to his own as set forth in the essay" (on the Christian ministry). See *Ignatius*, vol. i., p. 376, note 1. But Dr. Langen interprets the facts (see p. 82) in the light of this principle of succession, and therefore, I think, more *historically* than Dr. Lightfoot. I have not discussed the development of episcopacy in general, except so far as Dr. Sanday has led the way. For example, I have said nothing about the witness of the *Ignatian Epistles*. But it seems to me that the principle of succession is of infinitely more importance than the question through what variety of arrangements it has worked out. Obviously, for instance, the principle is not impugned, supposing it is to be believed that there was an equal college of Presbyter-Bishops at Corinth and Philippi at the end of the first century, who all equally held the right of perpetuating their office. When they laid on hands they did what was covered by their commission. They did not, like some sixteenth century Presbyters, take that honour to themselves.

tullian the Montanist is still conservative in doctrine; but "*novitas*" is his watchword in matters of discipline. In this region he denounces *custom:* "custom which, taking its origin from ignorance or simplicity, is *strengthened by succession into a practice*, and then is appealed to against the truth. . . . It is not the charge of novelty, but the truth, which refutes heresies. Whatever is against the truth, this is heresy, even an old custom." The rule of faith indeed is immovable, but "the other matters of discipline and life admit the novelty of correction, because the grace of God works and advances to the end." There is a gradual development then in the Church as the Spirit—"the Lord's Vicar"—gradually works out His plan of discipline. This development has for its content "the direction of discipline, the revelation of scriptures, the improvement of our understanding, the advance to a better state of things." It is like the natural development of physical life. The infancy of mankind was under the law and the prophets; it came to its hot youth under the gospel; now, through the Spirit (*i.e.* the spirit which inspired the new prophets, the Montanist spirit, the spirit in virtue of which they set "the Church of the Spirit against the Church of the Bishops"), it is realizing the strength of manhood (*nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem*). True, this has no direct bearing on the claim to possess a substitute for ordination; but when I read this language, and contrast it with that used in the *De Præscriptionibus*, I ask myself, Is there any justification for seeking in Montanism a survival of an earlier state of things? Moreover, the farther one carries back the Montanist movement to its cradle in Asia, the more innovating does its whole character appear. This is, at least, the conception of it formed by its latest historian, Dr. Harnack. He certainly would not agree with Dr. Sanday's estimate.[1]

[1] *Dogmengeschichte*, pp. 320–330. Cf. especially p. 323, note 3, where he points

To sum up then the criticism in a word. It seems to me that, to make Dr. Sanday's account of the development of the ministry a complete representation of history, there would be wanted a fuller recognition on his part of the principle of succession, and [of the substantial identity of the later Church ministry with the apostolic; or, in other words, there would be wanted more regard for the continuous claim of the ministry from the first in interpreting its *origines*.

C. GORE.

THE NEW THEORY OF THE APOCALYPSE.

AMONG the various theories that have been held, in ancient and in modern times, among orthodox Christians and others, on the subject of the origin and character of the Apocalypse, there is one thing which, until the other day, was not seriously called in question. The book might be the work of the Apostle John, of another St. John, also a faithful disciple of the Lord, or of Cerinthus or some other Judaising heretic; it might date from the reign of Galba, of Vespasian, or of Domitian; it might be a true prophecy of events immediately impending, of the events that will come at the very end of the world, or of all history from one to the other, or, again, it might be a wild fancy destined never to be fulfilled: but that it was the work of one age and of one man was admitted by

out that the claim to represent a prophetic succession (*Euseb.* v. 17), or to restore a former state of things, was (so far as it was made) an afterthought, due to the later desire to get a recognition from the Church. The earlier chapters of the *De Monogamia* will shed a strange light on the desperate character of the claim to be a *restitutio*. There were some heretics who really did make the claim to be the true conservatives. They were the Humanitarians, or Adoptionists, of the third century (*Euseb.* v. 28). The *Little Labyrinth* makes the suggestive rejoinder, "What they said might have been perhaps convincing, if, first of all, the Holy Scriptures had not contradicted them."

all. True it is, that Grotius, and in later times Vogel, Schleiermacher, and Bleek, raised doubts whether the whole was written at one time and on one plan, but they were willing to concede the unity of authorship; and Bleek, who alone among them was likely to have any considerable following, minimised if he did not retract his theory in his latest work on the subject. And yet the form and substance of the book might suggest, that there may well be interpolations in it. It belongs to a class of literature in which interpolation is very frequent, and in which interpolation implies no moral inferiority to the original writer. It is indeed the sole specimen (unless we count the *Shepherd* of Hermas)[1] that has come to us of the group, once probably considerable,[2] of Christian apocalypses. But this group is only one section of the larger class of Jewish apocalypses, of which we have several: indeed, the Christian and non-Christian classes pass into one another. The Second Book of Esdras was in all likelihood originally a purely Jewish work, of a period after Christianity had definitely separated itself from Judaism; but it has been expanded and recast by Christian hands. The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, on the other hand, has been regarded as the work of a Nazarene or orthodox Jewish Christian; but as soon as the view is suggested, that this also is a Jewish work interpolated by orthodox Christian hands, it becomes almost certain that this is the true explanation of its phenomena. The Apocalypse of Baruch is no doubt a Jewish work, of date later than the fall of Jerusalem; but it seems to show a know-

[1] It has been suggested that the *Shepherd* itself consists of portions of different dates. This view might explain the fact that in it, as in the Apocalypse, internal evidence points to an earlier date than external.

[2] See the Muratorian fragment, where the Apocalypses of John and (more doubtfully) of Peter are singled out as the only ones to be received as genuine or authoritative.

ledge of our Apocalypse.[1] And the much older Book of Enoch, some part at least of which was received as authoritative by Christians in the apostolic age, contains elements differing very widely in style and in value, and, so far as we can judge, in date and in doctrine.

And the position which the Joannine Apocalypse held in the early Christian Church was not very different from that which these apocalypses held both among Jews and among Christians. It was always regarded with reverence; but it was not, till a comparatively late day, received as one of the books of canonical Scripture, which, being the heritage of the universal Church, were incapable of addition or of any but the most inconsiderable local variations.

In the eastern Churches, in fact, the book hardly made its way into the canon till the invention of printing; at least, its literary and textual history stands quite apart from that of the other books. It is rarely included in one volume with them, rarely transcribed for its own sake, as a sacred text, without a commentary. The comparative rarity of copies is, no doubt, to be explained by their not being wanted, as the gospels and epistles were, for liturgical use; but this non-use of the book in liturgies is itself an evidence that it was regarded, even after its genuineness and inspiration were generally admitted, as being on a different footing from the rest of canonical Scripture. Moreover, the obscurity of the textual history of the book (see Westcott and Hort's *New Testament*, "Introduction," §§ 340, 344, seq.) points to the conclusion that its position in and before the fourth century was much the same as in late times; and we may think it likely, that while the Church continued to produce prophetical and other original religious works, there would be less scruple in making alterations in this book than in those whose authority was more unquestioned.

But an objection must be anticipated here. The book as

[1] Compare Baruch vi. 6–vii. 1 with St. John vii. 1.

it stands ends with an emphatic malediction on any one who interpolates or mutilates it: if it be, in any sense or measure, a work of the Spirit of God, that Spirit cannot have sanctioned such interpolation. The Jewish apocalypses with which it is sought to establish a parallel were not, in their original form, the work of the prophets whose names they bore; their later editors or interpolators, when they introduced into them what they judged true and edifying, were only doing what the authors did, with equally pious and no more fraudulent intent. The Revelation of St. John, on the other hand, does profess (truly or falsely) to be a revelation made to its actual author. Unless we take the view that some one fraudulently sought to pass off his work as that of St. John the apostle, we have no reason to doubt that "John," who is described as seeing the visions, did really write the book. Either then he had really seen the visions, or else he was a false prophet who "followed his own spirit, having seen nothing." And if we ask which of these views is likelier, quite apart from the theological question, whether we have here a revelation from the Spirit of God or no, the style and tone of the narrative seem to prove, on merely literary and psychological grounds, that we have here a record of a vision seen, and perhaps in part recorded, in a state of ecstasy. Thus, it will be said, the whole analogy breaks down between the Jewish apocalypses, where the name of the seer and the story of his vision are mere matters of literary form, and the Christian Apocalypse, where the name is either genuine or fraudulent, and the vision is a fact—in a Christian's eyes, a supernatural fact, giving the work a Divine authority.

And it is quite true that the analogy between the Jewish and the Joannine apocalypses does fail here, and that it is impossible to treat the work bearing St. John's name as though it were a member of the same class with those that bear the names Enoch, Esdras, etc. But it will not follow

that Christian reverence or orthodoxy demands that we shall assume the entire unity of the book. Suppose that St. John saw the vision as he describes it, and received in vision (as he says) a Divine command to write what he saw; yet he can hardly have written the whole, as it stands, while the vision was still before him. In fact, i. 9 almost inevitably suggests that the book, as we have it, was written after the seer had left Patmos. Now suppose the Revelation to be written in the same manner that, according to the Muratorian fragment, the gospel was. St. John, having seen the vision at Patmos, sits among his disciples at Ephesus, and records what he had seen, by the same Spirit by which he saw it; he either writes or dictates the inspired words describing the inspired sights. But now, whatever was the case at the moment of the vision, "the spirit of the prophet is subject to the prophet," and "if anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, the first holds his peace." It may therefore happen that there are episodes, visions or comments on the vision, which are not part of what was seen or heard by the original seer, and do not exactly fall into their place with it: though they are similar in tone and form, as having been suggested by it, and identical in doctrine with it, as coming from the same Spirit.

Nor is it quite inconceivable that inspired interpolations, such as we have supposed to be made by a contemporary prophet while St. John was composing the work, might be made also by a later prophet, after St. John had left it complete. Little as we know of the age immediately following St. John's death, we do know that the gift of prophecy was not reckoned to have failed with him; that the Church which rejected the claims of the Montanist prophets and prophetesses did not regard such claims as a mere anachronism, but contrasted their prophecy, on the merits of its method and substance, with the prophecy of

true catholic prophets of the same period or one only just past.[1] It is likely indeed that the inspiration of Ammia, Quadratus, and their contemporaries was of a lower order than that of St. John; but if he was inspired to write a book for the Church's instruction, we have no right to hold it impossible that they may have been inspired to edit and amplify it. And it might be the last prophet, not the first, who stereotypes the book in its final form upon penalty of the Divine curse.

We approach then without theological prejudice the question, Does the Apocalypse, as we have it, show traces of interpolation? are there any passages in it that we see grounds to assign to a date or authorship different from that of the main work? And first of all, we are struck by the fact that the book contains two formally distinct elements: there is the introduction, comprising the first three chapters, and the conclusion, of which the limits are not so clearly marked, but which may be taken to reach from xxii. 6 or 8 to the end; and between these there is the main series of visions. The distinction in form between these however proves nothing; they are as like in style and substance of thought as the difference in form admits of. The two are related to each other as the frame to a picture. Now, if we find a frame and a picture plainly made for one another, we do not say that a painter is not a goldsmith or a wood carver, and that therefore the two cannot be from the same hand; we leave that question open; and it is quite possible that the style of art may be so similar as to prove the picture and frame to have come from one mind, or even from one hand. Nor can we give much weight to the fact that it is only in the introduction and conclusion that we meet with the name John (for its insertion in xxi. 2 there is no authority worth mentioning). It is quite natural that, when recording the supernatural

[1] Eusebius; *H. E.* v. 17.

vision, he should forget himself; in chap. x. only, where his commission and authority is to be mentioned, could his name have been in place. Still we note the fact that it does not appear here or elsewhere, as it does several times in the first and last chapters.

But is the vision, or rather series of visions, extending from iv. 1 to xxii. 5 to be regarded as one continuous and harmonious whole? is this, at least, all certainly the work of one author? Our answer to this will vary, perhaps, according to our judgment on the *bona fides* of the Seer. If he was a mere imaginative writer, freely composing, and not possessed by any higher power than his own genius, we should certainly expect work of so high genius to have more unity of plan than we actually find. But if the vision were really seen in ecstasy, the sort of inconsequence and incompleteness which we find in it becomes intelligible. One may illustrate the action on the Seer's human faculties, even if the power acting on them was superhuman, by what happens to ourselves in dreams, trances, or delirium; we can parallel the differences between the symmetrical descriptions of chaps. i. or iv., v., and the broken utterances of chap. xi., by the difference of style and treatment between the first few lines of Coleridge's *Kubla Khan*, which are as coherent as *Christabel*, and those that follow towards the end of the fragment. The Seer has, no doubt, more self-control and self-possession than an ordinary dreamer; he never makes so near an approach as Coleridge to mere nonsense verse; as a rule, in the midst of his strangest visions, he knows what to look for and what to look at: but it will not surprise us if, now and then,

> "A change comes o'er the spirit of his dream,"

if he loses the thread of the story that he has been telling; if *e.g.* in chap. xi. he seems uncertain whether he *hears* or *sees* the fate of the two witnesses; or if in chap. xii. his

point of view, or the scene of action, seems to fluctuate between earth and heaven.

It is the total disregard of these considerations shown by Dr. Völter that prevents our attaching much weight to his theory—set forth in a little book, *Die Entstehung der Apokalypse*, published in 1882, new edition 1885. He has little difficulty in showing that there are many passages in the Revelation where we might have expected something different from what we find, where it is perhaps likely that a self-possessed writer would have put something different; he shows that there are some where a phrase is used in a different sense from what it bears elsewhere in the book, or that a doctrine is stated in one passage which is not put forward in another, more or less closely parallel. By arguments like these he succeeds, to his own satisfaction, in distinguishing five elements in the book. The first is "the original Apocalypse of the Apostle John, of the year 65 or 66," consisting of i. 4–6, iv. 1–v. 10 (the introductory words being of course modified, part of them being "told off" to i. 9, 10, and the "seven horns and seven eyes" of v. 6 being interpolated); vi. 1–vii. 8 (the last six words of vi. 16 being however an interpolation); viii. 1–ix. 21; xi. 14–19 (*vv.* 15 and 18 having a few words interpolated); xiv. 1–3 (*v.* 1 however running as in the Received Text, not the critical); xiv. 6, 7; xviii. 1–xix. 4; xiv. 14–20; xix. 5–10, the last clause being interpolated. Then comes "the supplement by the original Apocalyptic, of the year 68 or 69," containing only x. 1–xi. 13, xiv. 8, and chap. xvii. (without the reference to chaps. xv., xvi. at the beginning). Then followed three recastings, ascribed to the times of Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius respectively.

The arguments by which these dates are supported are, it is not too much to say, of much the same value as those by which the "continuous historical" school of interpreters were able to find any event in history symbolized by any

vision in the Apocalypse. A sober judgment will surely pronounce that, even if a critical method of such "vigour and rigour" as Völter's is anywhere admissible, it is totally out of place in a work like this. Even with books like Enoch and Esdras, that undoubtedly have undergone such successive rehandlings, it is a difficult and precarious task to determine the limits of each, and quite impossible to assign with such precision the dates of all; but the discrepancies of style there are far greater, and original inconsequences much less likely to occur, than in this book. Further, we have to account for the fact that the finished work is so widely circulated within twenty years of the last recension—being known to St. Justin,[1] as well as to the Churches of Gaul, Asia, and Africa in the last quarter of the second century; while all traces of the earlier forms of the work vanish entirely.

Yet, unconvincing as is Völter's method, and inadequate as are most of his arguments, one may feel a certain doubt whether their inadequacy does not unfairly prejudice the value of his conclusions. After all, the Apocalypse has an unquestionable unity of its own; it is (whatever else it is) a sublime work of art, though not of self-conscious art. There is in it a thread of continuity, of steady progress to an end. Episodes that could be detached may nevertheless be original; but there is a presumption that interruptions and contradictions are not. We give here a tabular analysis of the book, drawn up quite irrespective of Völter's or other theories, wherein the essential and the separable parts of the book are set over against one another. (It is, of course, sufficient to confine this analysis to the central portion, from iv. 1 to xxii. 5.)

[1] He refers to the passage on the millennium, which Völter assigns to Trajan's time. Völter tries to show that the passages which he supposes earliest written are the earliest used by other writers; but he does not deny that St. Justin probably, and the Church of Lyons in A.D. 177 certainly, had the whole work before them: only he guesses that St. Justin found Jerusalem designated, more expressly than at present, as the seat of the millennial reign.

Main Narrative.	Episodes, and Possible Interpolations.
iv. 1–v. 14. The Throne of God and of the Lamb is seen in the midst of the host of Heaven.	
vi. 1–17, viii. 1. The Lamb opens the seven seals of the Book (of Life?—cf. xx. 12, xiii. 8, xxi. 27).	vii. 1–3. Between the sixth and seventh seals is a pause, for the sealing of the Servants of God. Though episodical, this can hardly be interpolated; it is relevant after the end of chap. vi., and is presupposed in ix. 4.
	9–17. Vision of the Saints in triumph. Seems out of place here, but is analogous to xiv. 1–5, xv. 2–4.
viii. 2–ix. 21, xi. 14–19. Seven trumpets are sounded by Angels.	x. 1–xi. 13. Between the sixth and seventh trumpets is a pause; first, seven thunders utter their (unrecorded) voices, and the Seer receives a new commission; and he then hears foretold the prophecy, martyrdom, and resurrection of God's two Witnesses (Moses and Elias?) at Jerusalem. This seems very long for an episode. In position it is analogous to chap. vii.; but it is felt more decidedly as an interruption. The first part however belongs to this place.
xii. 1–10, 12–17. Was begun in Heaven, and transferred to earth, between the Dragon and the Woman and her Seed.	xii. 11. Somewhat interrupts the context.
xiii. 1–8, 11–18, xiv. 6–11, xviii. 1–xix. 21. War (foretold in chap. xi.?) between the Beast, as the Dragon's vicegerent, and the Saints of God.	xiii. 9, 10. Though occurring at a natural pause of the narrative, belongs to a class of passages that do not seem to belong to their context.
	xiv. 1–5. Is episodical, but not irrelevant.
	12. Is one of the comments out of relation to the context.

Main Narrative (*cont.*).	Episodes, and Possible Interpolations (*cont.*).
	13. Though different in style, seems equally out of relation to the context.
	14–20. Seems inappropriate at this place.
	xv., xvi. Are episodical, but relevant. xvi. 13, and the references in xvii. 1, xxi. 9, seem to show that this belongs to the original plan.
	xvi. 15, on the other hand, is a plain interruption of a continuous narrative.
	xvii. Can be omitted altogether, with some gain to clearness and consistency.
xx. 1–6. Partial and temporary establishment of the Kingdom of the Saints.	
7–10. Rebellion of the Dragon.	
11–15. Divine Judgment by God in person.	(Contrast the Judgment by the Son of Man in xiv. 14–17.)
xxi. 1–xxii. 5. Final and universal establishment of the Kingdom of God and Christ.	

We observe some coincidences here between this scheme and Völter's; that is, some of the passages here set aside as unessential to the main work are what he has marked as late interpolations, or as altered or misplaced by later editors. But before discussing the degree of probability that this coincidence may give to suspicions, it may be well to state and examine a theory, still more recent than Völter's, still more startling in its novelty, but whether sound or not, a great deal simpler and more plausible.

In June, 1885, Professor Harnack gave as a subject for a vacation exercise "the theological position of the author of the Apocalypse." Herr Eberhard Vischer, a student to whom this task was assigned, told him that "he had found

no solution but to explain the book as a Jewish apocalypse, with Christian interpolations, and set in a Christian frame." Dr. Harnack felt, as any one else would, an impulse to suppress the audacious undergraduate; but on reflection, he says, he found that "there fell as it were scales from his eyes": and he encouraged Herr Vischer to publish his views, giving the work the sanction of his own name, and a postscript by his own hand.

The "Christian setting" or "frame," on this view, is what we have already designated by the same image—the first three chapters and the last sixteen verses. And the "Christian interpolations" that it is necessary to assume are really remarkably few, and, with one great exception, such as can easily be dispensed with. Chap. vii. 9–17 is a passage that every one feels to come too soon in the narrative; "they who came out of the great tribulation" are shown in triumph, before the tribulation itself had been seen. The same may apply, in a less degree, to xiv. 1–5. Also xix. 9, 10 and xxii. 8, 9 might be thought not both to be original. Then xii. 11, xiii. 9, 10, xiv. 12, 13, xvi. 15—the last most of all—are manifest interruptions to their context, and cannot belong to the main plan of the work. The only question is, whether they are not *too* irrelevant ever to have been interpolated in cold blood—whether we ought not rather to suppose, that while the original prophet was writing or dictating, either he or another prophet present hears these Divine words, and they are written down when they are heard; having more or less of a spiritual, though no logical, connexion with what comes before and after them.

Nor will any one quarrel with Vischer for marking as interpolated the gloss giving the Greek name in ix. 11, and the word *Ἑβραϊστί* in xvi. 16. His theory is, that the original Jewish work was written in Hebrew, and that the Christian redactor of the enlarged work was the translator of the older part. Thus he attempts, whether successfully

or no, to account for the unity of style; unlike Völter, who leaves altogether unanswered this obvious objection to his theory. And the suggestion has a bearing on one important point on which Vischer is silent; *viz.* the relation between the language of the Apocalypse and that of the fourth gospel. The difference between the two is hardly greater than that between the prologue of the Son of Sirach and the main body of his book.

A more serious question arises on vi. 16, xi. 15, xx. 6, xxii. 3, with which may be connected xxi. 22, 23, xxii. 1, and perhaps xiv. 10, xv. 3. In the seven first cited passages, we have the names of God and Christ (under that title as an equivalent) coupled together as co-ordinate: in the first four of them, the mention of the two names is followed by a singular verb or pronoun. Either then the Seer not only regarded Christ as the co-equal Son of God, but held in its fullest sense the doctrine that "He and His Father are one," or else we have dogmatic grounds in all these passages, and grammatical grounds in the first group, for regarding the name of "Christ" or "the Lamb" as an interpolation. Of course we cannot discuss so wide a question here, only we must allow to those who take the latter view that the same argument will apply, if at all, against the original authenticity of v. 9–14, though the purely literary difficulty of supposing the climax of that glorious passage to be an interpolation is surely very great.

There remain a few other distinctively Christian passages, which Vischer is constrained to treat as interpolations: the name in xii. 17; one clause in xvii. 6; xvii. 14; three words in xviii. 20; a clause or two in xix. 11, 13; something more in xx. 4, 5; the last words in xxi. 9; and the last clause in xxi. 14. If the theory were accepted on other grounds, no one would find the rejection of these so difficult as to form a fatal objection to it.

But it is surely otherwise, when Vischer is constrained

to eliminate the name of the Lamb from the whole Apocalypse. Here he confesses that it is impossible, by the simple excision of a word or a phrase, to reduce the fifth chapter to what a Jew could have written; but he suggests that the part borne in the Christian Apocalypse by the Lamb may have been taken in the Jewish by "the Lion of the tribe of Judah." Harnack, still more strangely, suggests that in v. 6 the Opener of the seals was described simply as "one standing," presumably of a human figure.

Surely it is a strong objection to either of these views, that either the Man or the Lion "having seven horns and seven eyes" would be a grotesque figure, shocking to our natural reverence. But further, even if we suppose that the Opener of the seals was not originally "the Lamb standing as it had been slain"—*i.e.* the sacrificed but living Redeemer of Christian faith—still have we eliminated all that is distinctively Christian from His figure? If not the Christ of the gospel, who is He? Is He the Jewish Messiah? But He is (as we shall see) not born till chap. xii. He must therefore be the *pre-existent* Messiah, who surely is indistinguishable from the Christ of Christian, even of Joannine or catholic, belief.

This is really the weak point in Vischer's theory; its strong point is what we have just had occasion to allude to—that it explains chap. xii. of the birth of the Messiah, regarded, from a Jewish point of view, as yet future. No one doubts that, in chap. xi. and in chap. xiii. the Seer is describing, in a symbolic form, events which he means to foretell as impending, though very likely he saw the beginnings of them in the present. It is certainly hard to suppose that, between these visions of the future, an event is symbolically represented which was already some seventy years in the past, and of which the Seer and his readers were accustomed to think and speak, under no veil, but with "great plainness of speech." This is a real difficulty

to any Christian interpretation of the book, on the hypothesis of its unity. But once admit that the book, or at least this chapter, is Jewish, and all is clear. The writer foretells that the Daughter of Zion will give birth to the Messiah, that He will be caught away to God's presence, and that He will reappear (chap. xix.) at the head of the hosts of heaven, to overthrow the enemies of Israel.

It is more doubtful whether chap. xi. is, as Vischer thinks, equally easy to explain as a Jewish work, and equally hard to Christianize. The view is not peculiar to him, that the early verses of this chapter mean that, in the Roman siege of Jerusalem, the city would be taken, and even the outer court of the Temple profaned; but that nevertheless the inmost sanctuary, the altar before it, and the worshippers in the inner court, would remain inviolate. But though this has become a commonplace with the dominant modern school of interpreters, it surely is really so absurd, that we ought to hesitate to fasten the responsibility of it upon a man so highly endowed as our Seer was, even if not divinely inspired.

It is indeed credible enough, from the Jewish or perhaps the Judæo-Christian point of view, that when the LORD had chastened the sins of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem by allowing the heathen to cut them short, even to their last refuge, yet He would be "a wall of fire round about" to His Temple and to the remnant of His faithful ones. It is even said that, in the last crisis of the capture of the Temple, the fanaticism of its defenders was animated by an expectation of this sort. But was it credible, to a fanatic or to any one, that the Divine Captain of the host of Israel would confine Himself to a purely passive defence —that instead of breaking forth upon the ungodly, He would let them trample down the holy city for forty-two months, while the saints were cooped up in the inmost courts of the Temple? How, on this view, are the true worshippers to

be fed? and whence are they to find sacrifices for their worship? Surely it is more reasonable to suppose that the Temple which remains inviolable is the heavenly Temple, not the earthly, even though we are obliged to confess some uncertainty as to what is meant by the different fate of the outer court. We may even ask, if it is absolutely certain that what is said means that the outer court is to be profaned and the sanctuary protected. Zechariah ii. 4 (8, *Heb.*) rather suggests that the non-measurement may imply a boundlessness of blessing; and in 2 Samuel viii. 2, 2 Kings xxi. 13, Isaiah xxxiv. 11, Lamentations ii. 8, measurement is for destruction, not for preservation. While the Temple stood in its glory, the outer court was, in one sense, "given to the Gentiles"; it served to make the house of the Lord "a house of prayer for all nations." A Christian of the fourth, fifth, or twelfth century would have said that the destruction of the Jewish Temple made room for such a world-wide worship on its site; a very tolerant theist might add, that it has been the seat of a worship of God open to all nations in every age, from Constantine's days, if not from Hadrian's, to our own.

Thus after all, it seems that Vischer's hypothesis fails to make the book as a whole intelligible, since it can give no clear account of its Protagonist, who (in its present shape) bears the person of the Lamb. It is a poor set off to this, that it does make more intelligible the position of the one vision in chap. xii. Christians have not, after all, felt any insuperable difficulty in understanding this vision of the birth of *their* Christ; nor is there wanting a reason why His figure should be introduced just here. Here is to begin the *description* of "the great tribulation," which has been *foretold* in chaps. vii. and xi.; here then is the place where it is necessary to trace to its source the enmity between the dragon, the source of the persecuting spirit, and the people of God. It is the outcome of the ancient enmity

between the old serpent and the seed of the woman; the dragon has to be fought and overcome, first by the second Adam, who called Himself the Son of man, and then by those whom He is not ashamed to call brethren. His nativity is mentioned, to bring out the fact of His brotherhood with them—not without reference to the fact that He was actually persecuted from the very hour of His birth.

And there is another more general objection to Vischer's view. He rightly starts by pointing out that the Jewish and Christianized Jewish apocalypses have undergone successive recensions—some of them, it is likely enough, in the hands of translators; and he says that he supposes this Christianized Jewish Apocalypse to have gone through the same process. But those Jewish apocalypses have kept their original Jewish names. If this Jewish Apocalypse bore originally the name of an Old Testament worthy, and "John," in describing the vision with Christianizing additions, substituted his own name for the original one as that of the Seer, then we have a phenomenon absolutely unique. It perhaps is as well not to press the argument that it is a phenomenon hardly consistent with good faith; but we may say that, while St. John may have supposed this Jewish Apocalypse to be of Divine authority, as St. Jude seems to have thought the Book of Enoch,[1] it is for that very reason incredible that he should have erased the name that commended its authority to him.

Still, if we reject Völter's theory as altogether arbitrary, and Vischer's as raising more difficulties than it removes, we may still thank them for having suggested the question, whether the history and perhaps the interpretation of the book may not become clearer when we cease to assume its unity. In particular, there is a remarkable conflict between

[1] Perhaps, in fact, the Book of Enoch is used by the Seer himself. For this see Völter, *op. cit.*, pp. 113, 114.

external and internal evidence as to the date. A plausible if not absolutely convincing interpretation of chap. xvii.[1] points to the date A.D. 68–70. St. Irenæus is or ought to be a very trustworthy witness, when he tells us that the vision "was seen almost in our own days, at the end of the reign of Domitian." What if chap. xvii. was a vision really seen (by St. John or some one else) in Nero's time, and incorporated by him or by a contemporary or later editor[2] in the Revelation, the main part of which was seen or recorded under Domitian? The scarlet beast of chap. xvii., used as a beast of burden, though a similar, is not an identical image with the leopard-like beast of chap. xiii. and the main narrative that follows, who tyrannises over the whole world, and has its kings and their armies at his command. Again, the destruction of Babylon by the ten kings, in chap. xvii., seems a different conception from her destruction by an immediate Divine judgment, which seems implied in chap. xviii.[3] It seems an hypothesis worth examining, whether vii. 9–17, xi. 1–13, xiv. 14–20, xvii., are not originally independent visions,—visions however of the same Seer as the rest, or of the same prophetic school, and some or all of which (see chap. xvii. 1) may actually have been seen as part of the principal vision, memory passing into sight; just as some of his visions were undoubtedly

[1] Völter shows that the Hebrew letters of *Trajanus Adrianus* add up to 666 (with a variant 616), at least as accurately as those of *Nero Cæsar*.

[2] Rev. i. 1–3 look like an editor's gloss (but an authoritative editor's), closely analogous to xix. 35, xxi. 24, 25, in St. John's Gospel.

[3] It does not follow that, if the two prophecies are scarcely consistent in their imagery, the event will not be a fulfilment of both. Two of the happiest suggestions in apocalyptic interpretation are that of St. Hippolytus, that the monarchies into which the Roman empire is divided will turn into democracies; and St. Benedict's, that Rome will be destroyed, not by the nations, but by natural convulsions. When these interpretations of prophecy were proposed, there were no visible signs of the fulfilment of either: but the last ninety years have seen something more than a beginning of the fulfilment of the former; and for the latter, we know, as St. Benedict did not, that Rome stands as Pompeii did, on volcanic soil, within a few miles o volcanoes now extinct—for the present.

suggested by those of other seers recorded in the O.T. If so, we may believe that it is not without cause that these passages, and such parentheses as xvi. 15, etc., come in where they do; but in interpreting the book as a whole we may set them aside. They bear each their own meaning, which is usually plain enough; but they do not advance the story, or elucidate the meaning of the rest.

W. H. Simcox.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

III.

"Wherefore, though I have all boldness in Christ to enjoin thee that which is befitting, yet for love's sake I rather beseech, being such a one as Paul the aged, and now a prisoner also of Christ Jesus: I beseech thee for my child, whom I have begotten in my bonds, Onesimus, who was aforetime unprofitable to thee, but now is profitable to thee and to me."—Philem. 8–11 (Rev. Ver.).

After honest and affectionate praise of Philemon, the Apostle now approaches the main purpose of his letter. But even now he does not blurt it out at once. He probably anticipated that his friend was justly angry with his runaway slave, and therefore, in these verses, he touches a kind of prelude to his request with what we should call the finest tact, if it were not so manifestly the unconscious product of simple good feeling. Even by the end of them he has not ventured to say what he wishes done, though he has ventured to introduce the obnoxious name. So much persuading and sanctified ingenuity does it sometimes take to induce good men to do plain duties which may be unwelcome.

These verses not only present a model for efforts to lead men in right paths, but they unveil the very spirit of Christianity in their pleadings. Paul's persuasives to Philemon are echoes of Christ's persuasives to Paul. He had learned his method from his Master, and had himself experienced

that gentle love was more than commandments. Therefore he softens his voice to speak to Philemon, as Christ had softened His to speak to Paul. We do not arbitrarily "spiritualize" the words, but simply recognise that the Apostle moulded his conduct after Christ's pattern, when we see here a mirror reflecting some of the highest truths of Christian ethics.

I. Here is seen love which beseeches where it might command. The first word, "wherefore," leads back to the preceding sentence, and makes Philemon's past kindness to the saints the reason for his being asked to be kind now. The Apostle's confidence in his character, and in his being amenable to the appeal of love, made Paul waive his apostolic authority, and sue instead of commanding. There are people, like the horse and the mule, who understand only rough imperatives, backed by force; but they are fewer than we are apt to think, and perhaps gentleness is never wholly thrown away. No doubt, there must be adaptation of method to different characters, but we should try gentleness before we make up our minds that to try it is to throw pearls before swine.

The careful limits put to apostolic authority here deserve notice. "I might be much bold in Christ to command." He has no authority in himself, but he has in Christ. His own personality gives him none, but his relation to his Master does. It is a distinct assertion of right to command, and an equally distinct repudiation of any such right, except as derived from his union with Jesus.

He still further limits his authority by that noteworthy clause, "that which is befitting." His authority does not stretch so far as to create new obligations, or to repeal plain laws of duty. There was a standard by which his commands were to be tried. He appeals to Philemon's own sense of moral fitness, to his natural conscience, enlightened by communion with Christ.

Then comes the great motive which he will urge, "for love's sake"—not merely his to Philemon, nor Philemon's to him, but the bond which unites all Christian souls together, and binds them all to Christ. "That grand, sacred principle," says Paul, "bids me put away authority, and speak in entreaty." Love naturally beseeches, and does not command. The harsh voice of command is simply the imposition of another's will, and it belongs to relationships in which the heart has no share. But wherever love is the bond, grace is poured into the lips, and "I order" becomes "I pray." So that even where the outward form of authority is still kept, as in a parent to young children, there will ever be some endearing word to swathe the harsh imperative in tenderness, like a sword blade wrapped about with wool, lest it should wound. Love tends to obliterate the hard distinction of superior and inferior, which finds its expression in laconic orders and silent obedience. It seeks not for mere compliance with commands, but for oneness of will. Its entreaties are more powerful than imperatives. The lightest wish breathed by loved lips is stronger than all stern injunctions, often, alas! than all laws of duty. The heart is so tuned as only to vibrate to that one tone. The rocking stones, which all the storms of winter may howl round and not move, can be set swinging by a light touch. Una leads the lion in a silken leash. Love controls the wildest nature. The demoniac, whom no chains can bind, is found sitting at the feet of incarnate gentleness; so the wish of love is all-powerful with loving hearts, and its faintest whisper louder and more imperative than all the trumpets of Sinai.

There is a large lesson here for all human relationships. Fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, friends and companions, teachers and guides of all sorts, should set their conduct by this pattern, and let the law of love sit ever upon their lips. Authority is the weapon of a weak

man, who is afraid of his own power to get himself obeyed, or of a selfish one, who seeks for mechanical submission, rather than for the fealty of willing hearts. Love is the weapon of a strong man who can cast aside the trappings of superiority, and is never loftier than when he descends, nor more absolute than when he abjures authority, and appeals with love to love. Men are not to be dragooned into goodness. If mere outward acts are sought, it may be enough to impose another's will in orders as laconic as a drill sergeant's word of command; but if the joyful inclination of the heart to the good deed is to be secured, it can only be when law melts into love, and is thereby transformed to a more imperative obligation, written not on tables of stone, but on fleshy tables of the heart.

There is a glimpse here into the very heart of Christ's rule over men. He too does not merely impose commands, but stoops to entreat, where He indeed might command. "Henceforth I call you not servants, but friends"; and though He does go on to say, "Ye are My friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you," yet His commandment has in it so much tenderness, condescension, and pleading love, that it sounds far liker beseeching than enjoining. His yoke is easy, for this among other reasons, that it is, if one may so say, padded with love. His burden is light, because it is laid on His servant's shoulders by a loving hand; and so, as St. Bernard says, it is *onus quod portantem portat*, a burden which carries him who carries it.

II. There is in these verses the appeal which gives weight to the entreaties of love. The Apostle brings personal considerations to bear on the enforcement of impersonal duty, and therein follows the example of his Lord. He presents his own circumstances as adding power to his request, and, as it were, puts himself into the scale. He touches with singular pathos on two things which should sway his friend. "Such a one as Paul the aged." The alternative rendering

"ambassador," while quite possible, has not congruity in its favour, and seems to be a recurrence to that very motive of official authority which he has just disclaimed. The other rendering is every way preferable. How old was he? Probably somewhere about sixty—not a very great age, but life was somewhat shorter then than now, and Paul was, no doubt, aged by work, by worry, and by the unresting spirit that "o'er-informed his tenement of clay." Such temperaments as his are soon old. Perhaps Philemon was not much younger; but the prosperous Colossian gentleman had had a smoother life, and, no doubt, carried his years more lightly.

The requests of old age should have weight. In our days, what with the improvements in education, and the general loosening of the bonds of reverence, the old maxim that "the utmost respect is due to children," receives a strange interpretation, and in many a household the Divine order is turned upside down, and the juniors regulate all things. Other still more sacred things will be likely to lose their due reverence when silver hairs no longer receive theirs.

But usually the aged who are "such" aged "as Paul" was will not fail of obtaining honour and deference. No more beautiful picture of the bright energy and freshness still possible to the old was ever painted than may be gathered from the Apostle's unconscious sketch of himself. He delighted in having fresh young life about him—Timothy, Titus, Mark, and others, boys in comparison with himself, whom yet he admitted to close intimacy, as some old general might the youths of his staff, warming his age at the genial flame of their growing energies and unworn hopes. His was a joyful old age too, notwithstanding many burdens of anxiety and sorrow. We hear the clear song of his gladness ringing through the epistle of joy, that to the Philippians, which, like this, dates from his Roman captivity. A Christian old age should be joyful, and it only will be; for the

joys of the natural life burn low, when the fuel that fed them is nearly exhausted, and withered hands are held in vain over the dying embers. But Christ's joy "remains," and a Christian old age may be like the polar midsummer days, when the sun shines till midnight, and dips but for an imperceptible interval ere it rises for the unending day of heaven.

Paul the aged was full of interest in the things of the day, no mere "praiser of time gone by," but a strenuous worker, cherishing a quick sympathy and an eager interest which kept him young to the end. Witness that last chapter of the Second Epistle to Timothy, where he is seen, in the immediate expectation of death, entering heartily into passing trifles, and thinking it worth while to give little pieces of information about the movements of his friends, and wishful to get his books and parchments, that he might do some more work while waiting for the headsman's sword. And over his cheery, sympathetic, busy old age there is thrown the light of a great hope, which kindles desire and onward looks in his dim eyes, and parts "such a one as Paul the aged" by a whole universe from the old whose future is dark, and their past dreary, whose hope is a phantom and their memory a pang.

The Apostle adds yet another personal characteristic as a motive with Philemon to grant his request: "Now a prisoner also of Christ Jesus." He has already spoken of himself in these terms in *v.* 1. His sufferings were imposed by and endured for Christ. He holds up his fettered wrist, and in effect says, "Surely you will not refuse anything that you can do to wrap a silken softness round the cold, hard iron, especially when you remember for whose sake and by whose will I am bound with this chain." He thus brings personal motives to reinforce duty which is binding from other and higher considerations. He does not merely tell Philemon that he ought to take back Onesimus, as a

piece of self-sacrificing Christian duty. He does imply that highest motive throughout his pleadings, and urges that such action is "fitting" or in consonance with the position and obligations of a Christian man. But he backs up this highest reason with these others: "If you hesitate to take him back because you ought, will you do it because I ask you? and, before you answer that question, will you remember my age, and what I am bearing for the Master?" If he can get his friend to do the right thing by the help of these subsidiary motives, still, it is the right thing; and the appeal to these motives will do Philemon no harm, and, if successful, will do both him and Onesimus a great deal of good.

Does not this action of Paul remind us of the highest example of a similar use of motives of personal attachment as aids to duty? Christ does thus with His servants. He does not simply hold up before us a cold law of duty, but warms it by introducing our personal relation to Him as the main motive for keeping it. Apart from Him, morality can only point to the tables of stone, and say: "There! that is what you ought to do. Do it, or face the consequences." But Christ says: "I have given Myself for you. My will is your law. Will you do it for My sake?" Instead of the chilling, statuesque ideal, as pure as marble and as cold, a Brother stands before us with a heart that beats, a smile on His face, a hand outstretched to help; and His word is, "If ye love Me, keep My commandments." The specific difference of Christian morality lies not in its precepts, but in its motive, and in its gift of power to obey. Paul could only urge regard to him as a subsidiary inducement. Christ puts it as the chief, nay, as the sole motive for obedience.

III. The last point suggested by these verses is the gradual opening up of the main subject matter of the Apostle's request. Very noteworthy is the tenderness of

the description of the fugitive as "my child, whom I have begotten in my bonds." Paul does not venture to name him at once, but prepares the way by the warmth of this affectionate reference. The position of the name in the sentence is most unusual, and suggests a kind of hesitation to take the plunge, while the hurried passing on to meet the objection which he knew would spring immediately to Philemon's mind is almost as if Paul laid his hand on his friend's lips to stop his words, "Onesimus then is it? that good-for-nothing!" Paul admits the indictment, will say no word to mitigate the condemnation due to his past worthlessness, but, with a playful allusion to the slave's name, which conceals his deep earnestness, assures Philemon that he will find the formerly inappropriate name, Onesimus—*i.e.* profitable—true yet, for all that is past. He is sure of this, because he, Paul, has proved his value. Surely never were the natural feelings of indignation and suspicion more skilfully soothed, and never did repentant good-for-nothing get sent back to regain the confidence which he had forfeited with such a certificate of character in his hand!

But there is something of more importance than Paul's inborn delicacy and tact, to notice here. Onesimus had been a bad specimen of a bad class. Slavery must needs corrupt both the owner and the chattel; and, as a matter of fact, we have classical allusions enough to show that the slaves of Paul's period were deeply tainted with the characteristic vices of their condition. Liars, thieves, idle, treacherous, nourishing a hatred of their masters all the more deadly that it was smothered, but ready to flame out if opportunity served in blood-curdling cruelties—they constituted an ever-present danger, and needed an ever-wakeful watchfulness. Onesimus had been known to Philemon only as one of the idlers who were more of a nuisance than a benefit, and cost more than they earned; and he apparently

ended his career by theft. And this degraded creature, with the scars on his soul deeper and worse than the marks of fetters on the limbs, had somehow found his way to the great jungle of a city, where all foul vermin could crawl and hiss and sting with comparative safety. There he had somehow come across the Apostle, and had received into his heart, filled with ugly desires and lusts, the message of Christ's love, which had swept it clean, and made him over again. The Apostle has had but short experience of his convert, but he is quite sure that he is a Christian; and, that being the case, he is as sure that all the bad black past is buried, and that the new leaf now turned over will be covered with fair writing not in the least like the blots that were on the former page, and have now been dissolved from off it, by the touch of Christ's blood.

It is a typical instance of the miracles which the gospel wrought as every-day events in its transforming career. Christianity knows nothing of hopeless cases. It professes its ability to take the most crooked stick and bring it straight, to flash a new power into the blackest carbon, which will turn it into a diamond. Every duty will be done better by a man if he have the love and grace of Jesus Christ in his heart. New motives are brought into play, new powers are given, new standards of duty are set up. The small tasks become great, and the unwelcome sweet, and the difficult easy, when done for and by Christ. Old vices are crushed in their deepest source; old habits driven out by the force of a new affection, as the young leaf-buds push the withered foliage from the tree. Christ can make any man over again, and does so recreate every heart that trusts to him. The miracles of transformation are wrought to-day as truly as of old. Many professing Christians experience little of that quickening and revolutionising energy; many observers see little of it, and some begin to croak, as if the old might have ebbed away. But wherever men give

the gospel fair play in their lives, and open their spirits, in truth and not merely in profession, to its influence, it vindicates its undiminished possession of all its former power; and if ever it seems to fail, it is not the medicine that is weak, but the sick man that has not really taken it. The low tone of much modern Christianity and its dim exhibition of the transforming power of the gospel is easily and sadly enough accounted for without charging decrepitude on that which was once so mighty, by the patent fact that much modern Christianity is little better than lip acknowledgment, and that much more of it is woefully unfamiliar with the truth it in some fashion believes, and sinfully negligent of the spiritual gifts which it professes to treasure. If a Christian man does not show his religion changing him into the fair likeness of his Master, and fitting him for all relations of life, the reason is simply that he has so little of it, and that little so mechanical and tepid.

Paul pleads with Philemon to take back his worthless servant, and assures him that he will find Onesimus helpful now. Christ does not need to be besought to welcome His runaway good-for-nothings, however unprofitable they have been. That Divine charity of His forgives all things, and "hopes all things" of the worst, and can fulfil its own hope in the most degraded. With bright, unfaltering confidence in His own power He fronts the most evil, sure that He can cleanse; and that no matter what the past has been, His power can overcome all defects of character, education, or surroundings, can set free from all moral disadvantages adhering to men's station, class, or calling, can break the entail of sin. The worst needs no intercessor to sway that tender heart of our great Master, whom we may dimly see shadowed in the very name of "Philemon," which means one who is loving or kindly. Whoever confesses to Him that he has "been an unprofitable servant" will be welcomed to His heart, made pure and good by the Divine

Spirit breathing new life into him, will be trained by Christ for all joyful toil as His slave, and yet His freedman and friend; and at last each once fugitive and unprofitable Onesimus will hear the "Well done, good and faithful servant!"

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

SOME LESSONS OF THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

III. UNIFORMITIES OF LANGUAGE RESTORED.

1. THE Revisers of the New Testament of 1881 aimed, as we have seen, at the most scrupulous faithfulness. They endeavoured to enable the English reader to follow the correspondences of the original with the closest exactness, to catch the solemn repetition of words and phrases, to mark subtleties of expression, to feel even the strangeness of unusual forms of speech. The Revisers of 1611 adopted and defended a very different mode of procedure. "Another thing," they say in their preface, "we think good to admonish thee of, gentle Reader, that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done. . . . Truly that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before . . . we were especially careful. . . . But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as, for example, if we translate the *Hebrew* or *Greek* word once by *purpose*, never to call it *intent*; . . . if one where *joy*, never *gladness*, etc., thus to mince the matter, we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would

breed scorn in the atheist than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? . . . We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good *English* words . . . if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always; and to others of like quality, Get you hence, be banished for ever; we might be taxed peradventure with *St. James'* words, namely, *To be partial in ourselves, and judges of evil thoughts.* Add hereunto, that niceness in words was always counted the next step to trifling; and so was to be curious about names too. . . ."

2. Now I do not wish to discuss these statements in the abstract. It is easy to imagine cases in which the method of translation here indicated would be not only harmless but even right. We may then put aside the theory in itself, as it is thus stated in justification of the varieties of rendering admitted in the A.V., and simply consider some of the variations themselves. The English student will be perfectly able to judge whether the gain which is secured by such uniformity as the new Revision offers is sufficient to compensate for the disturbance of some familiar rhythms, some graceful turns, in the old Version.

3. The faithful consistency of the Revision, which I desire now to illustrate, is shown in two ways: (1) in the restoration of approximate unity to the rendering of the same words under similar circumstances, when they had been differently rendered in A.V.; and (2) in the distinction of different words which had been left undistinguished in A.V. It is unfaithfulness of the same kind to create differences in a translation which do not exist in the original, and to hide differences which are found in it.

In both respects the arbitrariness of the older English Versions appears to be incapable of any serious or sub-

stantial defence; and the Revisers of 1611 were content in this respect to leave the translation as they found it.

4. The variations in rendering the same original words sometimes extend to whole clauses, and it is difficult to see how the considerations advanced by the "translators" in their preface can apply to such cases. For example, the words of Deut. xxxii. 35 are quoted identically from the LXX. (Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω) in Rom. xii. 19 and Heb. x. 30: in the former passage the rendering is, *Vengeance is Mine; I will repay;* and in the latter, *Vengeance belongeth unto Me, I will recompense.* It may be urged that the general sense is the same in the two sentences. Of that I say nothing now; but a careful reader would necessarily suppose that St. Paul and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had different copies of the Old Testament before them, and might draw important conclusions from the imaginary fact. And what shall we think when even in the same Epistle the same words from Ps. xcv. are translated in one place, *They shall not enter into My rest* (Heb. iii. 11, with a marginal note), and in another place, *If they shall enter into My rest* (iv. 3, without any note)? It is hard to see why the literal rendering of the Hebrew idiom is not given in the first case, if it is allowable in the second case without a margin.

5. The strictest fidelity of rendering is specially necessary in parallel passages. It is well known, for example, that the first three gospels have a large common element, the primitive oral gospel of the Apostles, as I believe, which has been variously modified and supplemented by the several Evangelists to meet the wants of different classes. The English reader has therefore a right to expect that he will find in the version which is placed in his hands a faithful indication of the verbal concordance or difference between the several narratives. These afford the clue, often slender and subtle, to the particular meaning of a

passage. And here at least there is no question of language or style. A rendering which has been once adopted may be repeated.

However obvious this principle may be, it does not appear to have been taken into account in the Revision of 1611; and there can be no doubt that the real relation of the Synoptic Gospels to one another, with all the lessons which follow from the minute differences of the record, have been greatly obscured by the arbitrary discrepancies and concordances to which King James' Revisers gave a place in the A.V.

6. Why, for instance, should the words addressed to Bartimæus, which are the same in the original texts of the two Gospels, be rendered in St. Mark, *Thy faith hath made thee whole* (Mark x. 52, with a marginal note), and in St. Luke, *Thy faith hath saved thee* (Luke xviii. 42)? What shall we say to the almost continuous difference in the renderings of identical phrases, such as the following?—

St. Mark xii. 38–40.	St. Luke xx. 46 f.
Beware of the scribes,	*Beware of the scribes,*
which love to go *in long* clothing,	*which desire to* walk *in long* robes,
and love salutations *in the* market-places,	*and love* greetings *in the* markets,
and the chief *seats in the synagogues,*	*and the* highest *seats in the synagogues,*
and the uppermost *rooms at feasts:*	*and the* chief *rooms at feasts;*
which devour widows' houses,	*which devour widows' houses,*
and for a pretence *make long prayers:*	*and for a* shew *make long prayers:*
these *shall receive greater damnation.*	the same *shall receive greater damnation.*[1]

7. It will of course be said that in this case the general sense is the same in both versions. Whether this is so or not, it is clear that the careful English reader has lost

[1] It may be added, that the Revisers of 1881 have not distinguished the opening verbs, which are different in the two Gospels (βλέπετε, προσέχετε).

the important fact of the general identity of expression. Sometimes also the sense is seriously affected. If we read in Mark xv. 33 that there was *darkness over the whole land* (without margin), and in Luke xxiii. 44 that *there was a darkness over all the earth* (with margin), we naturally infer that the incident is differently described in the two narratives; and the margin in St. Luke suggests an attempt at reconciliation. The Greek however is absolutely the same in the two places (ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν).

8. But the offences of the A.V. against consistency are most conspicuous in the treatment of single words; and no changes in R.V. have provoked more hasty criticism than those which were due to the effort of the Revisers to give to the English reader in this respect a faithful reflection of the original.

We can all remember the general cry which was made on the day after the publication of the Revised New Testament, when it was found that in the record of the Passion it was said that *two robbers were crucified with Jesus*. Could there, it was asked, be a more foolish piece of pedantry? At the time it seemed sufficient to ask in reply what the critic proposed to do with the phrase, *Now Barabbas was a robber* (John xviii. 40), where the same original word was correctly rendered in the same connexion. But it may be worth while to notice now how that simple word "robber" (λῃστής) appears as a sign of the wild disorder of the times. Aspirations after freedom were used as a cloke for brigandage, as in oppressed nations at all times. Open violence affected to be resistance to foreign oppression. The "robber" is at one end of the scale of dishonest dealers, and the "thief" at the other. The "thief" has his own place in the imagery of Scripture (*e.g.* 1 Thess. v. 2, 4; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. iii. 3). He is placed side by side with the "robber" in the Lord's condemnation of the false Christs (John x. 1, 8). But in every case where the

"robber" is mentioned in the New Testament, the idea is that of open violence, and not of cunning stealth. The rulers of the people had made the house of God *a den of robbers* (Matt. xxi. 13), as the phrase stands in the Old Testament (Jer. vii. 11); they did not plunder secretly, but used bold extortion and tyranny. The traveller from Jerusalem to Jericho fell among "robbers" (Luke x. 30; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 26), who needed no hidden ambush for the repetition of their crime. And the circumstances of the passion become more vivid and more impressive, when we realise that the "robber"—the false patriot,—one of the *men who in the insurrection had committed murder* (Mark xv. 7), was chosen by the people for release before the true Saviour, and that the penitent "robber," to whom the Lord dispensed His royal promise from the cross, was one who in his wild life might have had confused thoughts of a kingdom of God, as the final aim of his lawless struggles. The narrative of the betrayal receives a new touch when we hear the Lord's question in its true form: *Are ye come out as against a robber with swords and staves to seize Me?* (Matt. xxvi. 55, and parallels.) To apprehend a "thief" there would be no need of an armed force.

9. It is not, I suppose, seriously argued now, that in this case consistency of rendering is not a clear gain. We have grown familiar with the thought and the rhythm. But many feel still a natural regret that the word "charity" has no place in the R.V. The word was deliberately retained in some passages of the A.V., and especially in 1 Cor. xiii., on the ground of its ecclesiastical associations, though the word so rendered (*ἀγάπη*), was more than three times as often rendered "love." Charity is indeed a word of most touching sweetness. It can never lose its position in the vocabulary of Christian graces. But to retain it in the New Testament is to hide the source of its strength and glory. No one, as far as I am aware, ever proposed to

adopt into our English Version the Latin rendering, "Deus est caritas," *God is charity*, which stands in the Rhemish translation; and yet no loss to Christian morality could be greater than the separation of the grace from its Divine archetype. The strength of the Christian character lies in the truth that he who has love shares according to his measure in the Divine nature. Thus by using in English different words to express the relation of God to man and of man to men, calling the one "love" and the other "charity," where the original Scriptures use one word only to describe in this aspect the relations of God to man, and of man to God, and of man to man, we weaken the bond which unites the human and Divine, we remove the revelation of that harmony which exists, according to the idea of creation, between man made in the image of God and God Himself. It is still further of great importance that "charity" has no corresponding verb. We cannot express in terms of charity, so to speak, St. John's words: "*Beloved, if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another. . . . God is love; and he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him* (1 John iv. 11–16).[1] And when we say "God is love" (1 John iv. 16), and "charity never faileth" (1 Cor. xiii. 8), we have lost the connexion between the two thoughts; we have lost, that is, a link which unites by an essential bond the teaching of St. John and St. Paul.

Am I not then right in believing that when once the facts are seen in their fulness, the English reader will recognise his gain in having the greatest of human graces indissolubly connected with the very being of God, and seen to be eternal because He is eternal.[2]

[1] It will be interesting to compare the Rhemish Version. *My dearest, if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another. . . . God is charity, and he that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him.*

[2] An examination of all the passages in which "charity" (A.V.) has been replaced by "love" (R.V.) is instructive: 1 Cor. viii. 1; xiii.; xiv. 1; xvi. 14

10. The two signal examples of restored unities of rendering which have just been given are evidently fitted to arrest and to keep attention. They illustrate conspicuously two typical classes of similar changes. The one gives back to us the true sense of the outward setting, so to speak, of the apostolic history; the other lays open a deeper view of Christian truth. In other cases the lesson which flows from uniformity in rendering may easily be overlooked. But even so the effect, if it be less striking, is not to be neglected. Sometimes, for example, the repetition of an identical phrase gives to a statement a pathetic emphasis, which is destroyed by difference of rendering. No one, I think, can fail to feel (dare I say so?) the music of the words of the Baptist as they stand now in John iii. 31, in exact conformity with the original: *He that is of the earth is of the earth* (not is *earthly*), *and of the earth he speaketh.* And the correction involves more than an altered rhythm. *Earthly* stands in the same chapter for a different word (ἐπίγειος) and a different idea (*v.* 12).

So it is that very frequently the solemn repetition of one word fixes attention on the central thought of the writer, and materially helps to its interpretation. A patient English student will feel what he gains by the faithful representation of St. Paul's language in the recurrence of *reckoned* in Rom. iv. 3–8; of *abolished* in 1 Cor. xv. 24, 26; of *subjected* (*subject*) in 1 Cor. xv. 28; of *affliction* (*afflict*) and *comfort* in 2 Cor. i. 4–8; of *made manifest* in 2 Cor. v. 10, 11; of *glory*, 2 Cor. xi. 16 ff; of *comfort* in 2 Thess. ii. 16 f; and of St. John's characteristic words, *witness* in John i. 7 ff, 19 ff; viii. 13–18; of *judgment* in John v. 22–29.[1]

11. In the majority of cases the repetition of the same

(comp. *v.* 24); Col. iii. 14 (comp. ii. 2); 1 Thess. iii. 6 (comp. *v.* 12); 2 Thess. i. 3 (comp. 1 Thess. i. 3); 1 Tim. i. 5 (comp. *v.* 14), ii. 15, iv. 12 (comp. vi. 11); 2 Tim. ii. 22; iii. 10; Tit. ii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 8, v. 14; 2 Pet. i. 7; 3 John 6; Rev. ii. 19.

[1] Sometimes a correspondence has been left unmarked; *e.g.* John xi. 19, 31.

word in the same context is essential to the full expression of the thought or argument. No one, after a little patient thought, can miss the force or pathos of the original form of expression in the following passages, which had been neglected in A.V. and have now been restored.

Matt. xxiii. 12 (comp. Luke xiv. 11; xviii. 14), *Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be* humbled (A.V. abased); *and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted.* There is an absolute correspondence between the Divine retribution and the human action. Perhaps the words offer a glimpse of the working of the chastisements of God. Matt. xxv. 46, *These shall go away into* eternal (A.V. everlasting) *punishment: but the righteous into eternal life.* The issues of our conduct, both bad and good, are shown in relation to the same unseen order, and as answering to its laws (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 18).[1]

Mark xii. 41 f: *He beheld how the multitude cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much. And there came a poor widow, and she* cast (A.V. threw) *in two mites. . . .* The identity of the outward form of the acts is an important point in the narrative.

Mark xiii. 12: *Brother shall deliver up brother to death, and the father his* child (A.V. son); *and children shall rise up against parents. . . .* The repetition of the word which expresses the natural relation deepens the gloom of the picture.[2]

Luke xi. 33 f: *No man, when he hath lighted a* lamp, (A.V. candle) *putteth it . . . under the bushel, but on the stand, that they which enter in may see the light. The* lamp (A.V. light) *of thy body is thine eye: when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light.* It is essential to

[1] Comp. Matt. iv. 20, 22; xiii. 20 f (*straightway*, four renderings in A.V.); xviii. 33 (*had mercy*); xx. 20 (*sons*); xxi. 25 (*from*); xxii. 2 f (*marriage-feast*); xxiii. 16, 18 (*is a debtor*); xxv. 32 (*separate, separateth*).

[2] Comp. Mark iii. 5 (*stretch forth, stretched forth*); v. 27 f (*garment, garments*); v. 38 f (*tumult*); vi. 35 (*far spent*); x. 13 f (*little children*).

the understanding of the passage that there should be a distinction between the organ through which the illumination is given and the light itself (comp. Matt. vi. 22; John v. 35; 2 Pet. i. 19; Rev. xxii. 5).[1]

John vi. 27 f: Work (A.V. labour) *not for the meat which perisheth. . . . They said therefore unto Him, What must we do, that we may work the works of God?* The question takes up the word of the Lord.

John xv. 26 f: *The Spirit of truth . . . shall* bear witness (A.V. testify): . . . *and ye also bear witness. . . .* The twofold witness must be regarded in its common features (comp. Acts v. 32).[2]

Acts xxvi. 24 f: *Festus saith with a loud voice, Paul, thou art* mad (A.V. beside thyself). . . . *But Paul saith, I am not mad, most excellent Festus. . . .* The correspondence is exact in the original (*μαίνῃ, οὐ μαίνομαι*), and the intervening words must not be allowed to obscure it.[3]

Rom. xv. 4, 5: *Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written . . . that through patience and through comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope. Now the God of patience and of* comfort (A.V. consolation) *grant you. . . .* The very point of the prayer lies in the fact that the living God is the one source of the characteristic blessings which come through His word.

This appeal to the nature of God is seen even in a more striking form a little later on in the same chapter.

Rom. xv. 12, 13: *There shall be the Root of Jesse; . . . on Him shall the Gentiles* hope (A.V. trust). *Now the God of hope fill you with all joy, . . . that ye may abound in*

[1] Comp. Luke ii. 4 (*called*); v. 3 f (*put out*); vii. 33 f (*is come*); ix. 28, 37 (*the mountain*); xvii. 21, 23 (*Lo, here*); xviii. 25 (*enter*); xix. 13, 15 (*trade herewith, gained by trading*); xxii. 8 f (comp. 12 f, *make ready*); xxiv. 29 (*abide*).

[2] Comp. John i. 39 (*abode*); ii. 8 f (*ruler of the feast*); iii. 2, 10 (*teacher*); iii. 11 (*bear witness, witness*); iii. 12 (*told you, tell you*); viii. 33 ff (*bondage, bondservant*); ix. 19, 21 (*how*); xv. 2, 4, 5 (*bear*); xv. 9 f (*abide*); xx. 25 (*put*).

[3] Comp. Acts xvii. 18, 23 (*set forth*); xix. 24 f (*business*); xxi. 39 f (*give leave*); xxiii. 25, 33 (*letter*); xxvii. 10, 21 (*injury, loss*).

hope. . . . The God of revelation, the God of the Covenant, can alone inspire and support this expectation of a world-wide gospel.[1]

1 Cor. iii. 17: *If any man* destroyeth (A.V. defile) *the temple of God, him shall God destroy.* The punishment is the exact correlative of the offence (comp. 2 Cor. v. 10; Col. iii. 25, marg.; 2 Pet. ii. 12 f, R.V.).

1 Cor. xii. 4 ff: *There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are* diversities (A.V. differences) *of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of* workings (A.V. operations), *but the same God, who worketh all things in all.* In such a description of the Divine action, it is obviously of the highest importance to preserve the uniformity of St. Paul's language.

Gal. ii. 8 f: *He that wrought* (A.V. adds "effectually") *for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision* wrought (A.V. the same was mighty) *for me also unto the Gentiles; and . . . they . . . gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the* Gentiles (A.V. heathen), *and they unto the circumcision.* The two arbitrary variations in A.V. mar the symmetry of the picture which St. Paul draws of the twofold apostolic endowment and mission.[2]

[1] Comp. Rom. i. 19 (*manifest, manifested*); ii. 2 f (*practise*); v. 2, 3, 11 (*rejoice*, Gk. *glory*); vii. 7, 8 (*covet, coveting*); xi. 22 f (*continue*); xv. 19 (*power*); xvi. 3, 5 ff, 11 (*salute*); xvi. 3, 9, 21 (*fellow-worker*).

[2] Comp. 1 Cor. i. 19 (*prudence, prudent*); ii. 14 f (*judged, judgeth*); vii. 16 (*how*); ix. 22 (*become, am become*); x. 16, 18, 20 (*communion, have communion*, contrast *partake*); xiii. 8, 10, 11 (*done away, put away*); xvi. 1 f (*collection, collections*).

2 Cor. ii. 3 ff (*sorrow, made sorry, caused sorrow*); v. 6, 8, 9 ([*to be*] *at home*); vii. 9, 11 (*made sorry*); x. 4 f, 8 (*casting down*); xii. 3 (*know not, knoweth*); xii. 9 (*weakness, weaknesses*).

Gal. iii. 22 f (*shut up*); iv. 8 f ([*to be*] *in bondage*).

Eph. v. 15 (*unwise, wise*).

Phil. i. 4 (*supplication*); ii. 13 (*worketh, to work*); iii. 4 (*have confidence*).

Col. ii. 13 (*trespasses*).

1 Tim. i. 15 f (*chief*); ii. 7 (*truth*).

2 Tim. iii. 8 (*withstood, withstand*).

In Heb. xii. the full force of a quotation from the Old Testament is twice lost by failure to preserve the significant word in the application:

v. 5: *Ye have forgotten the exhortation, which reasoneth with you as with* sons (A.V. children), *My son, regard not lightly the chastening of the Lord. . . .*

vv. 27 f: *This word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, . . . that those things which are not shaken may remain. Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be* shaken (A.V. moved), *let us have grace. . . .*[1]

1 Pet. ii. 4 f: *Unto whom coming, a living stone, . . . ye also, as* living (A.V. lively) *stones, are built up a spiritual house. . . .* The wholly unwarranted change of rendering obscures the thought of the relation of the Head to the members, to borrow St. Paul's image.

1 John v. 18 f: *We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not; but He that was begotten of God keepeth him, and* the evil one (A.V. that wicked one) *toucheth him not. We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in* the evil one (A.V. wickedness). The "world" is "in the evil one," even as believers are "in Christ" (comp. John xvii. 15).[2]

12. In most of the passages which have been hitherto noticed, an identical rendering has been restored to a word variously translated by A.V. in the same context. Very frequently the variation occurs in passages widely scattered. But it is no less important in these cases also to preserve the identity which discloses to the careful student a fresh sign of the clear precision of view which marks the apostolic writings.

[1] Comp. Heb. xi. 27, 28, 29 (*by faith*); xi. 35 (*resurrection*).

[2] Comp. Jas. i. 4 f (*lacking, lacketh*); ii. 2 f (*clothing*).
1 Pet. i. 7, 13 (*revelation*); iii. 14 (*fear*).
1 John ii. 24 (*abide*); iii. 12 (*evil*); 3 John 14 (*salute*).
Rev. xiii. 13 f (*signs*); xviii. 2 (*unclean*); xx. 3, 5, 7 (*finished*); xx. 13 (*gave up*); xxi. 18 (*pure*).

Thus, to take an illustration from a single book. One word in the Revelation (*θρόνος*), variously rendered in A.V. by "throne" and "seat," conveys in the original a far-reaching vision of the spiritual order, which is wholly obliterated by the diversity of translation. *I know where thou dwellest*, is the message to the angel of the Church of Pergamum, *even where Satan's* throne (A.V. seat) *is: and thou holdest fast My name* . . . (Rev. ii. 13). There is a kingdom of the evil one upon earth; and a brute force which represents its power: *The dragon gave* [*the beast*] *his power, and his* throne (A.V. seat), *and great authority* (Rev. xiii. 2). But it is doomed to overthrow: *The fifth* [*angel*] *poured out his bowl upon the* throne (A.V. seat) *of the beast; and his kingdom was darkened* (Rev. xvi. 10). Meanwhile the prospect is opened of a sovereignty of the saints. They are allowed to share the royal dignity of their Lord in their representatives: *Round about the throne were four and twenty* thrones (A.V. seats): *and upon the* thrones (A.V. seats) *I saw four and twenty elders sitting, arrayed in white garments; and on their heads crowns of gold* (Rev. iv. 4). And when the proclamation was made, *The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of His Christ, . . . the four and twenty elders, which sit before God on their* thrones (A.V. seats), *fell upon their faces, and worshipped God* . . . (Rev. xi. 15, 16. Comp. Matt. xix. 28).

More commonly the correspondences must be traced through several books. A remarkable verb, for example (*ἀπεκδέχομαι*), is used, and used exclusively, with one exception, of the attitude of the Christian towards the future revelation of the Lord. This is rendered in A.V. five times "wait for," and twice "look for." It is obviously a clear gain to conform these two last passages (Phil. iii. 20, Heb. ix. 28) to the others; but no one, till he had learnt the facts, could rightly understand the reason for the change.[1]

[1] Sometimes the form of association was strong enough to resist a required

So again St. Paul uses a characteristic verb (καταλλάσσειν), and the derivative noun (καταλλαγή), to express the establishment of the right relation between God and man. The verb is uniformly rendered "reconcile"; the noun, which occurs four times, has three renderings, "reconciliation" (2 Cor. v. 18, 19), "atonement" (Rom. v. 11), "reconciling" (Rom. xi. 15). Faithfulness requires a single translation, and the word "reconciliation" is in every way an appropriate equivalent of the Greek. It is the more important to fix the use of the form "reconciliation" because it has been wrongly used in Heb. ii. 17 (A.V.) to express a totally different root (ἱλάσκεσθαι, ἱλασμός), which is elsewhere rightly expressed by "propitiation."

13. The last illustration shows the necessity of preserving, if possible, a corresponding translation through a group of kindred words. We have seen already how important is the application of this principle to the group of words connected with "love." It has an illustration also from the words expressing "fear." No one can fail to catch at once the difference between "fear" and "fearfulness," the fact and the temper. When therefore the adjective (δειλός) is most happily rendered "fearful" (Matt. viii. 26, Mark iv. 40, Rev. xxi. 8), it is desirable to represent the same thought in the noun, "fearfulness" (2 Tim. i. 7), and in the verb, "to be fearful" (John xiv. 27).[1]

14. A familiar title will furnish another illustration. The Aramaic Rabbi is sometimes given in the Gospels in its original form, and sometimes by the Greek equivalent rendered "Master" (or "Teacher"). The retention of the

conformity. For example in Luke xxii. 20 we read *poured out*, but in Matthew xxvi. 28 *shed* was retained, the different connexion being supposed to justify the retention of the familiar word. Nor did the American Company dissent from this conclusion.

[1] Comp. Acts iv. 36, xi. 23 (*son of exhortation, exhorted*); Col. ii. 9 f (*fulness, made full*); 1 Thess. ii. 4 (*approved, proveth*); 2 Thess. ii. 16 f (*gave us comfort, comfort*); 2 Tim. iii. 17 (*complete, furnished completely*).

Aramaic word may indicate something as to the sources of the particular narratives, or perhaps give a touch of personal feeling to the address; but in any case, it is desirable to preserve in the English Version a feature which can be made as clear as in the Greek. So it is that *Rabbi* has been introduced in Matthew xxvi. 25, 49; Mark ix. 5, xi. 21, xiv. 45; as it was already given in A.V. in Matthew xxiii. 7, 8.

The common title received a fuller form, as expressive of higher respect, in the unusual form Rabboni (Rabbuni), which is found twice in the Gospels. This was simply rendered "Lord" in Mark x. 51, and the interpretation given in St. John (xx. 16) is "Master." The two passages are now brought into harmony; and some will be inclined to see more than an accidental coincidence in the use (and the record of the use) of the peculiar form on these two occasions.

15. The changes which have been noticed so far were made with the view of bringing the different parts of the New Testament into harmony. One other series of changes was made to bring out the connexion between the Old and New Testaments more clearly. The familiar forms of the Old Testament names are given by the R.V. in place of the Græcised forms of A.V., when a person or place known in the Old Testament is referred to in the New Testament. The misunderstanding which has been caused by the use of the Greek form *Jesus* for *Joshua* in two places (Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8) is known to every one; and such forms as Osee, Elias, Sarepta, are puzzling to many readers, though in a less degree. Where the old form has a distinct English equivalent, as James, it seemed well to notice the original (Jacob) in the margin.

16. In a few cases a coincidence of language in the original has been noticed in the margin, when an identical rendering was not accepted for the text. The most remark-

able example is furnished by the treatment of the word which is now almost naturalised among us as "Paraclete." As applied to the Holy Spirit in the Gospel of St. John this is rendered "Comforter," and as applied to the Son in St. John's first Epistle, "Advocate." In each case a note is added (John xiv. 17, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7; 1 John ii. 1), which brings the identity of the original term clearly before the reader. So again, a peculiar word (ἔξοδος) is rendered closely "departure," and a marginal note records this sense in the two other places in which it is found (Luke ix. 31; 2 Pet. i. 15).[1]

The illustrations which have been given are of very unequal interest. Some include changes of great importance; others may appear to be trifling. Some are obvious; others are required by considerations which spring from careful study. But no one, I believe, will question that they are required by faithfulness; that they give fresh vigour and meaning to the apostolic words when they are allowed to have their full weight; that any disturbance of familiar phrases is far more than balanced by the fuller expression of the original message. And, so far, it may be added, no change has been noted which involves alteration of the "received" Greek text.

B. F. Westcott.

THE GERMAN AND THE ANGLO-AMERICAN REVISIONS OF THE BIBLE.

We live in an age of revision and reconstruction, which will probably be followed by a new reformation. The modern progress of discovery and research in Biblical learning in Protestant countries is so great, that it imperatively demands a revision of the translations made in the sixteenth

[1] Comp. Acts iii. 15; Heb. ii. 10, xii. 2.

and seventeenth centuries, when Hebrew and Greek were imperfectly understood, Biblical geography and archæology were yet in their infancy, and the science of textual criticism was not yet born, and the material for it not yet collected. Hence all the authorized versions which have been in public use in Protestant Churches during the last two or three hundred years have undergone, or are now undergoing, a revision.

The two most prominent and important revisions are those of the German Luther Bible and of the English version which bears the name of King James; that is, of the two versions which have exerted by far the greatest influence upon theology, religion, and literature, and which have the largest constituency. Both are now completed, and extensively used as commentaries in the pulpit and in private, but not yet accepted by the Churches for which they were intended in lieu of the old versions which they were to supersede. A brief comparison of them may not be without interest to the readers of THE EXPOSITOR.

The official revision of Luther's version was inaugurated, after long previous agitation and discussion, by the "Eisenach German Evangelical Church Conference" in 1863, and published under the title, *Die Bibel oder die ganze Heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments nach der deutschen Uebersetzung D. Martin Luthers:* Halle (Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses), 1883. It is called the *Probebibel*, or the *Proposed Bible* subject to the verdict of the Churches. The revised New Testament had been published several years before, and is printed by Dr. O. von Gebhardt, together with the Greek text, in his *Novum Testamentum Græce et Germanice:* Leipzig, 1881.

The revision was prepared with extraordinary care, but in an ultra-conservative spirit, by a number of distinguished Biblical scholars appointed by the ecclesiastical authorities of the German governments.

The work was very severely criticised by opposite schools for changing too much or too little, and was recommitted by the Eisenach Conference of 1886 for final action. The history of this revision is told in the preface and introduction to the *Probebibel*, and in Grimm's *Geschichte der luth. Bibelübersetzung :* Jena, 1884, pp. 48–76.

The Anglo-American revision of the Authorized English Version of 1611 was set in motion by the Convocation of Canterbury, and carried out in fifteen years, between 1870 and 1885, by two committees, one in England and one in the United States (each divided into two companies, one for the Old Testament, one for the New, and each consisting of scholars of various Protestant denominations). Dr. Dorner, on his visit to America in 1873, desired to bring about a regular co-operation of the two revision movements, but it was found impracticable, and confined to private correspondence. A brief history of this English revision is given in Schaff's *Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version*, second edition, 1885.

The two revisions are similar in spirit and aim; and as far as they run parallel, they agree in most of the improvements. Both aim to replace the old version in public and private use; but both depend for ultimate success on the verdict of the Churches for which they were prepared. They passed through the same purgatory of hostile criticism, both from conservative and radical quarters; but the chief objection to the English revision, at least, of the New Testament, is that the changes are too many, while in the German they are too few. They mark a great progress of Biblical scholarship, and the immense labour bestowed upon them can never be lost.

The difference of the two arises from the difference of the two originals on which they are based, and its relation to the community.

The authorized German and English Versions are equally

idiomatic, classical, and popular; but the German is personal, and inseparable from the overawing influence of Luther, which forbids radical changes. The English is impersonal, and embodies the labours of three generations of Biblical scholars, from Tyndale to the forty-seven revisers of King James, a circumstance which is favourable to new improvements in the same line.

In Germany, where theology is cultivated as a science for a class, the interest in revision is confined to scholars; and German scholars, the most independent and bold in theory, are very conservative and timid in practical questions. In England and America, where theology moves in close contact with the life of the Churches, revision challenges the attention of the laity, which claims the fruits of theological progress. Hence the Anglo-American Revision is much more thorough and complete.

It embodies the results of the latest critical and exegetical learning. It involves a reconstruction of the original text, which the German Revision leaves almost untouched, as if all the painstaking labour of critics since the days of Bengel and Griesbach down to Lachmann and Tischendorff (not to speak of the equally important labours of English scholars, from Mill and Bentley to Westcott and Hort) had been in vain.

As to translation, the English Revision removes not only misleading errors, but corrects the far more numerous inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the minor details of grammar and vocabulary; while the German revision is confined to the correction of acknowledged mistranslations, or rather, the most glaring of them. The German Revision of the New Testament numbers only about two hundred changes, the Anglo-American thirty-six thousand. The Revised German New Testament is widely circulated; but of the provisional *Probebibel*, which embraces both Testaments, only five thousand copies were printed and sold by the

Canstein Bibelanstalt at Halle (as I learned there from Dr. Kramer, July, 1886). Of the Revised English New Testament, a million copies were ordered from the Oxford University Press before publication, and three million copies were sold in less than a year. The text was telegraphed from New York to Chicago in advance of the arrival of the book. The Bible, after all, is the most popular book in the world, and constantly increasing in power and influence, especially with the English-speaking race.

Both Revisions have met with much commendation, but perhaps with a larger amount of adverse criticism, especially from ultra-conservative quarters. We should not be surprised at this, nor at the slow progress which they are making in public recognition and use. No perfect work can be expected from imperfect men. Nor is it possible to please everybody. It took fifty years before King James' Version superseded the Bishops' Bible and the Geneva Version.

No translation is an absolute reproduction. This, in the nature of the case, is impossible. Every translation reflects the spirit of the age, the state of learning, and the ecclesiastical and religious atmosphere from which it proceeded, and is therefore necessarily imperfect.

But there is a gradual progress in translation, going hand in hand with the progress of the understanding of the Bible. A future generation will make a still nearer approach to the original text in its purity and integrity. If the Holy Spirit of God shall raise the Church to a higher plane of faith and love, and melt the antagonisms of human creeds into the one creed of Christ, then, and not before then, may we expect perfect revisions of the oracles of God.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. Professor J. Agar Beet.

Thought it not Robbery to be Equal with God . . . 115

Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.

Survey of Recent Old Testament Literature . . . 73

The Book of Psalms in the Revised Version . . . 304

Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D.

The Prophetess Deborah 38

The Prophet Amos.—I. Jehovah, God of Israel . . 161

Principal Sir J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S.

Gold, Bedolach, and Shoham Stone. A Study of Genesis ii. 10–14 201

Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D.

Recent English Literature on the New Testament . 154, 235

Haggai 344

Esther 401

Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.

Notes on Difficult Texts 55, 259

Josiah Gilbert.

The Agony in the Garden 180

Rev. Professor F. Godet, D.D.

The Epistle to Philemon 138

The Epistle to the Gentile Churches 376

Rev. C. Gore, M.A.

The Origin of the Christian Ministry 411

Rev. Professor Adolf Harnack, D.D., Ph.D.

On the Origin of the Christian Ministry 321

Professor J. Rendel Harris, M.A.

Dr. Sanday on the Christian Ministry 225

Rev. Professor A. F. Kirkpatrick, M.A.

Survey of Recent Old Testament Literature . . . 77

PAGE

Rev. Alexander Maclaren, D.D.

The Epistle to the Colossians:

XXIV. Tychicus and Onesimus, the Letter-Bearers . 60

XXV. Salutations from the Prisoner's Friends . 125

XXVI. Closing Messages 215

The Epistle to Philemon:

I. 270

II. 363

III. 443

Rev. J. Macpherson, M.A.

Dr. Sanday on the Origin of the Christian Ministry . . 282

T. E. Page, M.A.

The Prophecy concerning Judas 355

Rev. Frederick Rendall, M.A.

"Faithful is the Word" 314

Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D.

The Origin of the Christian Ministry:

I. Recent Theories 1

II. Criticism of Recent Theories 97

Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D.

The German and the Anglo-American Revisions of the Bible 468

Rev. W. H. Simcox, M.A.

Canon Westcott 22

The New Theory of the Apocalypse 425

Rev. Professor H. L. Strack, D.D., Ph.D.

The Work of Bible Revision in Germany:

II. Critical Part 193

Rev. Professor B. B. Warfield, D.D.

Recent American Literature on the New Testament . . 392

Rev. Professor B. F. Westcott, D.D., D.C.L.

Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament:

I. Introductory 81

II. Exactness in Grammatical Details . . . 241

III. Uniformities of Language Restored . . . 453

INDEX OF TEXTS.

	PAGE
Genesis ii. 10–14	201
xviii. 4	267
Exodus xxii. 26	166
Numbers xxiv. 17	166
Deuteronomy xxxii. 35	455
Joshua vi. 18	59
xix. 47	59
Judges i.	51
ii. 7	51
v.	38
xi. 11, 30	53
1 Samuel i. 5	55
i. 20	57
viii. 5	268
2 Samuel xiv.	162
1 Kings xi. 29	47
xvi.	47
2 Kings xiv. 25	161
xv. 10	259
Esther	401
Job xl. 2	263
Psalm ii. 1	305
ii. 12	305
iii. 4	306
iv. 8	306
viii. 5	306
xvi. 3	307
xvi. 10	308
xvii. 14	308
xxiv. 6	310
xxix. 1	310
xlv. 3	312
xlv. 6	312
xlv. 13	313
lxix. 2	360
cix.	361
cxxvi. 1	346
cxxxvii. 5	345
Proverbs vi. 11	269
Isaiah i. 16	267
iv. 4	267
xv., xvi.	161
xlviii 1	262
Jeremiah vii. 9	263
xv. 1	38
xlviii. 7	49
Ezekiel xvi. 9	267
Hosea xii. 13; Micah vi. 4	40
xiii. 9	260
xiii. 11	268
Amos	161
ii. 10, 11	39
Micah ii. 7	261
ii. 12, 13	263
Haggai	344
Zechariah xiv. 5	162
Matthew v. 16	258
viii. 26	466
xxi. 13	458
xxiii. 8–10	322
xxiii. 12	461
xxv. 36–43	285, 461
xxvi. 55	458
Mark iii. 5	461
x. 52	456
xv. 33	457
Luke xi. 33	461
xviii. 42	456
xxii. 44	180
xxii. 53	187
xxii. 55	246
xxiii. 44	457
John i. 14	90
i. 18	89
i. 28	89
i. 29	89
iii. 31	460
iv. 29	258
v. 39	96
vi. 15	115
Acts viii. 39	115
2 Corinthians xii. 2	115
John x. 1–8	457
xiv. 17, 26	468
xiv. 30	187
xviii. 40	457

	PAGE
John xix. 2, 3	93
xix. 24	258
xx. 30	244
xxi. 15–17	92
Acts i. 16–21	355
vi. 1	324
vi. 1–3	101
xii. 17	326
xiii. 1	108, 417
xiv. 23	419
xx. 17	103
xx. 17, 28	335
xx. 28	101, 286
Romans xii. 6–8	329
xii. 19	455
xv. 4, 5	462
xvi. 4	323
xvi. 7	13, 417
1 Corinthians i. 17; ix. 14	415
xii. 28	14, 324, 327
xiii. 8	459
xiv. 18, 19	390
Galatians i. 1	416
i. 19; ii. 9, 12	325
i. 22	323
ii. 8	463
Ephesians	376–391
i. 3–6	382
i. 15; iii. 2; iv. 21	377
ii. 11–18	383
ii. 20; iii. 5	417
iii. 18	391
iv. 2–16	385
iv. 11	14, 331, 343
Philippians i. 1	12, 101, 330
i. 1; 1 Timothy iii. 1; Titus i. 7	287
ii. 4	121
ii. 6	115
iii. 21	242
Colossians i. 1	389
iv. 6	143
iv. 7	379
iv. 7–9	60
iv. 10–14	125
iv. 15	215
Colossians iv. 16	379
1 Thessalonians v. 2, 4	457
v. 12	329
1 Timothy i. 15; iii. 1; iv. 9; 2 Timothy ii. 11; Titus iii. 8	314
iii. 1–13; v. 17–19	12, 290
iv. 14	107, 417
v. 17; iii. 2	16
v. 17	335, 416
vi. 10	252
Titus i. 5–7	104, 422
i. 5	335
i. 9	107
Philemon	138
1–3	270
4–7	363
8–11	443
Hebrews ii. 17	466
iii. 11	455
v. 7	189
vii. 21	91
x. 24	92
x. 30	455
xii. 4, 5	190, 464
xiii. 7, 17	422
James i. 27	285
ii. 2	323
v. 14	414
1 Peter ii. 4	465
ii. 21; iv. 1	125
ii. 25	285
iv. 12	185
v. 1, 2	104
v. 1	343
v. 1–5	422
2 Peter i. 15	468
v. 1	334
1 John iii. 4	95
iv. 11–16	459
v. 18	465
Revelation	425
ii. 13	465
xi. 15, 16	465
xiii. 2	465
xvi. 10	465

Butler & Tanner, The Selwood Printing Works, Frome, and London.